

tudi matematika ne more pomagati.

Zelo nerad sem pisal te vrstice. Napisati sem jih morao, ker bi se dalo iz mojega molka sklepati, da se s predloženo analizo strinjam.

Mitja Brodar
Inštitut za arheologijo
Znanstvenoraziskovalnega centra SAZU
Novi trg 2
SI-1000 Ljubljana

Brunislav Marijanović: *Prilozi za prapovijest u zaleđu jadranske obale*. Monografije 2. Filozofski fakultet u Zadru Sveučilišta u Splitu. Zadar 2000. 237 stranica, 50 slika, 11 priloga i 81 tabla.

Darko PERIŠA

Knjiga koju ću recenzirati djelo je Brunislava Marijanovića, profesora prethistorijske arheologije i arheološke metodologije na Filozofskom fakultetu u Zadru, koji se već 25 godina posvetio istraživanju neolitika, eneolitika i brončanog doba na istočnoj jadranskoj obali i u njezinom zaleđu. U knjizi su objavljeni rezultati arheoloških iskopavanja na tri prethistorijska nalazišta u istočnoj Hercegovini koje je autor izveo dok je bio arheolog u Zemaljskom muzeju Bosne i Hercegovine u Sarajevu. Knjiga je objavljena na hrvatskom jeziku s opsežnim sažetkom na engleskom tako da je pristupačna širokom krugu arheologa. Odmah upada u oči da naslov knjige nije dovoljno precizan, jer riječ je o nalazištima na istočnoj jadranskoj obali i to samo u njezinom južnom zaleđu.

Knjiga se sastoji od kratkog predgovora, tri tematske cjeline, zaključnih razmatranja, bibliografije i sažetka na engleskom jeziku. Najveći dio obuhvaćaju tri tematske cjeline u kojima su zasebno izneseni rezultati istraživanja na građini Guvninama, Hateljskoj pećini i pećini Lazaruši. Tematske cjeline sastoje se od više poglavlja, tako da svaka predstavlja zasebnu studiju. Autorova su izlaganja vrlo strogo organizirana i stoga pregledna. Rukopis je završen 1991., ali knjiga do danas nije mogla biti objavljena zbog izbijanja rata u Bosni i Hercegovini, autorove moralne odgovornosti prema Zemaljskom muzeju u Sarajevu tijekom rata i na kraju nedostatka financijskih sredstava u Zemaljskom muzeju teško stradalom u ratu. Važno je napomenuti da autor poslije završetka rukopisa nije više unosio nove radove i gledišta drugih arheologa, osim svojih radova objavljenih do 1994.

iznad zaselka Gagrica, na području sela Lokava kod Čapljine. Pokusno iskopavanje izvedeno je 1984., a sustavna 1988. i 1989. Ukupno je istražena površina od 330 m², što je, u odnosu na raspoloživu površinu i očuvanost nalazišta, gotovo optimalno moguć istraživački zahvat. Kulturni sloj bio je vrlo tanak, a najveća debljina bila je 0,8 m. Na Guvninama se sasvim jasno izdvajaju dvije razvojne faze od kojih starija pripada razvijenom eneolitiku, a mlađa srednjem brončanom dobu. Eneolitičko naselje bilo je malo i kratkotrajno i, za razliku od mlađeg naselja, nije bilo zaštićeno kamenim bedemima. Brončano-dobno naselje zauzimalo je cijelu površinu nalazišta i bilo je zaštićeno s tri prstena suhozidnih bedema od kojih vanjski bedem ograničava prostor veličine oko 180 x 170 m. Ispred vanjskog bedema nalaze se i dva kratka poteza posebnih nasipa čiji je smisao dodatno ojačavanje krajnje istočne i zapadne točke gradine. Ne postoje nikakve indicije koje bi upućivale na postupno širenje mlađeg naselja. Gradina se nalazi na vrlo plodnom području koje pruža mogućnost razvoja različitih ekonomskih grana. Ipak, sasvim egzaktni podatci o ekonomiji i starijeg i mlađeg naselja krajnje su oskudni, ali je autor i u takvoj situaciji izvukao osnovne zaključke. Veličina i kratkotrajnost starijeg naselja govore nam da se njegovo stanovništvo bavilo stočarstvom i to nomadskog tipa. Trajniji karakter mlađeg naselja i brojni primjerci kamenih žrvnjava govore nam da je glavna ekonomska grana njegovog stanovništva bila zemljoradnja za koju u okolini Guvnina postoje i najbolji uvjeti. Stanovništvo se pored zemljoradnje bavilo i stočarstvom i lovom.

Hateljska pećina nalazi se na vrhu jednog obronka planine Trusine, iznad zaselka Hatelja, na području Berkovića kod Stolca. Pećina ima veličinu 28 x 20 m. Uvjeti za naseljavanje postojali su samo u prednjem dijelu pećine. Pokusno iskopavanje izvedeno je 1984., a sustavna 1987. i 1988. Ukupno je istražena površina od 96 m², što odgovara približno polovici korištenog dijela pećine. Debljina kulturnih slojeva varirala je od 0,2 m na samom ulazu do oko 2,8 m u unutrašnjosti. Iznad najmlađeg kulturnog sloja nalazio se recentni sterilni sloj koji je u unutrašnjosti bio debeo i do 1,4 m. Iako autor to ne objašnjava, tako debeo recentni sloj sigurno je rezultat duge upotrebe pećine kao tora za stoku. U Hateljskoj pećini izdvojeno je pet razvojnih faza od kojih I. pripada ranom neolitiku, II. kasnom neolitiku, III. razvijenom eneolitiku, a IV., koja je podijeljena na dvije podfaze, ranom i srednjem brončanom dobu. Kratkotrajna V. faza pripada srednjem vijeku. U naseljavanju pećine bilo je nekoliko dužih prekida koji su potvrđeni sterilnim slojevima. Samo između

III. i IV. faze ne postoje nikakvi prekidi i oni čine jednu stratigrafsku cjelinu. Iskopavanja su dala zanimljive podatke o organizaciji prostora i života u pećini od kojih navodimo samo najvažnije: ognjišta su smještena isključivo uz rubove pećine, središnji prostor je služio kao komunikacija i imao je drenažu od nabacanog amorfnog kamenja, a ulaz je bio tijekom hladnijih razdoblja u godini zatvoren drvenom konstrukcijom. Ekonomija stanovništva Hateljske pećine temeljila se na stočarstvu i lovu, dok su svi drugi oblici privređivanja, uključujući tu i zemljoradnju, imali drugorazrednu ulogu.

Pećina Lazaruša nalazi se u široj okolini Dabrice kod Stolca. Pećina je smještena u iznenađujućem ambijentu koji predstavlja uski kanjon sezonske rijeke Radimlje, usječen u nekoliko stotina metara visoke obronke okolnih planina tako da se uska traka plavog neba jedva probija između strana kanjona obraslih bujnom vegetacijom. Pećina je skromne veličine: dugačka je 13 m, a najveća joj je širina, na samom ulazu, oko 6 m. Pokusno iskopavanje izvedeno je 1984., a sustavno 1988. Ukupno je istražena površina od 25 m², što je, u odnosu na korišteni dio pećine, optimalno moguć istraživački zahvat. Kulturni slojevi dosežali su debljinu do 2,2 m. U Lazaruši se sasvim jasno izdvajaju dvije razvojne faze od kojih starija pripada prijelazu iz neolitika u eneolitik, a mlađa razvijenom eneolitiku. U naseljavanju pećine bila su dva prekida koja su potvrđena sterilnim slojevima i zvijerinjskim jamama ukopanim u kulturni sloj. Stariji sterilni sloj odgovara dužem prekidu između dviju razvojnih faza, jer je poslije njega došlo do velikih promjena u materijalnoj kulturi. Mlađi sterilni sloj odgovara kratkom prekidu tijekom trajanja mlađe razvojne faze. Podjela mlađe faze na dvije podfaze ima samo formalan karakter, jer nije popraćena nikakvim promjenama u materijalnoj kulturi. Pećina zbog svoje veličine nije mogla primiti društvenu zajednicu veću od jedne obitelji, odnosno više od 5 do 6 pojedinaca. Autor ostavlja otvorenim pitanje je li pećina služila kao stalno, ili pretežito stalno mjesto življenja upravo jedne takve društvene cjeline, ili je u pitanju drukčije organizirana i drukčijim interesima povezana zajednica. Stanovništvo pećine svoj je opstanak temeljilo na stočarstvu, i to na uzgoju stoke sitnog zuba (ovce i koze), i lovu. Okolica pećine ne pruža nikakve uvjete za zemljoradnju, jer potpuno nedostaje obradivo tlo.

U nastavku osvrta prikazat ću najvažnije rezultate istraživanja i prokomentirati neke autorove zaključke. Krenimo kronološkim redom.

Faza I. Hateljske pećine pripada ranom neolitiku i impresso kulturi. Autor je tu fazu vezao za III. fazu Zelene pećine iznad Blagaja kod Mostara.

Glavno obilježje impresso kulture na ta dva nalazišta jesu vrlo gusti redovi utisnutih i žigosanih ukrasa koji prekrivaju cijelu površinu posuda. U Zelenoj pećini nedostaju ukrasi izvedeni utiskivanjem ruba školjke, dok su oni u Hateljskoj pećini vrlo rijetki. Otkrićem Hateljske pećine, Zelena pećina prestala je biti usamljeni predstavnik tog specifičnog ukrasnog stila, a to daje dodatnu vrijednost njezinom promatranju kao predstavnika posebne varijante impresso kulture koju je izdvojio Alojz Benac. Toj varijanti pripada i pećina Jejinovača, ali riječ je samo o povremenom boravištu u ekonomskoj zoni stanovnika Hateljske pećine.

Treba se podsjetiti da je prije 20-ak godina upravo B. Marijanović doveo pod znak pitanja opravdanost izdvajanja zasebne varijante impresso kulture u Zelenoj pećini. Budući da se Zelena pećina nalazi na vrlo važnoj komunikaciji koja dolinom Neretve i Bune preko Nevesinjskog polja vodi u unutrašnjost, on je smatrao da fizionomija impresso kulture na tom nalazištu ne odražava samostalni i lokalni razvoj, već predstavlja skup elemenata proizišlih iz dinamičnog i kontinuiranog kretanja u njezinoj neposrednoj blizini, ali bez vidnijeg utjecaja na ukupan razvoj ranog neolitika u Hercegovini (Marijanović 1980-1981, 44). Drugim riječima, raznovrsnost ukrasa na posudu iz Zelene pećine rezultat je povremenih boravaka različitih skupina ljudi u ranom neolitiku na tom mjestu. Hateljska pećina koja je udaljena od te komunikacije potvrdila je opravdanost izdvajanja posebne varijante impresso kulture koja je vezana za istočnu Hercegovinu.

Oko 25% ukupnog broja posuda u sloju I. faze Hateljske pećine sačinjava monokromna keramika čiji se oblici približavaju onima iz danilske kulture, ali autor naglašava da nije riječ o čisto danilskim oblicima. Autor ne objašnjava niti postavlja pitanje označava li monokromna keramika u Hateljskoj pećini: a) vanjske utjecaje na impresso kulturu iz čega će se poslije razviti danilska kultura; b) početak izrastanja danilske iz impresso kulture na tom mjestu; c) rezultat kontakata između stanovništva Hateljske pećine i nositelja rane danilske kulture koja se počela razvijati u blizini.

U sloju I. faze Hateljske pećine nađen je i ulomak barbotinske posude i ulomak posude ukrašen slikanim spiralnim motivom. Posude su uvezene iz starčevačke kulture. Autor smatra da je naselje miješane starčevačko-impresso kulture u Obrama I. kod Kaknja u srednjoj Bosni odigralo posredničku ulogu u prenošenju tog posuda u Hateljsku pećinu. Sam autor kaže da tu pretpostavku dovodi u sumnju činjenica da na starčevačkom slikanom posudu u Obrama I. nisu zabilježeni spiralni motivi, ali da ta okolnost ne bi smjela presudno utjecati na vrijed-

nost pretpostavke, jer moguće je da je riječ i o slučajnosti vezanoj za površinu na kojoj je istraživanje provedeno. Meni se ta pretpostavka ne čini vjerojatna iz drugih razloga. Prvo, autor je sasvim izgubio iz vida nalazišta starčevačke kulture na sjeveru Crne Gore od kojih je pećina Odmut kod Plužina, koja se nalazi na granici starčevačke i impresso kulture, od Hateljske pećine udaljena samo 50-ak km zračne linije. Zbog toga je puno vjerojatnije da su te posude i dospjele iz nekog naselja starčevačke kulture u Crnoj Gori ili jugozapadnoj Srbiji. Drugo, glavno obilježje impresso komponente u Obrama I. jesu tremolo ukrasi koji su u Hateljskoj pećini skoro potpuno odsutni. Isto tako, u impresso komponenti u Obrama I. nisu poznati motivi svojstveni za Hateljsku pećinu. Izravne veze ta dva naselja odrazile bi se, više od svega, na posudu impresso kulture.

Autor smatra da je vremenski položaj I. faze Hateljske pećine između prijelaza iz zrele u kasnu fazu impresso kulture i početka danilske kulture (str. 111-112). Vremensku i prostornu podjelu impresso kulture na istočnoj jadranskoj obali i u njezinom zaleđu iscrpno je razradio Johannes Müller u svojoj disertaciji (Müller 1994), ali ona je objavljena nakon završetka rukopisa Marijanovićeve knjige. Međutim, J. Müller je prije toga objavio sažetak kronoloških razmatranja iz svoje disertacije (Müller 1991, 311-358), ali ni taj rad Marijanović nije iskoristio u svojoj knjizi. J. Müller je sva nalazišta impresso kulture u Hercegovini svrstao u posebnu varijantu koju je nazvao Huminama. Takav zaključak nije prihvatljiv, jer ukrasni se stilovi na nalazištima u istočnoj i zapadnoj Hercegovini jako razlikuju, a ukrasni stil u zapadnoj Hercegovini, iako nedostaju ukrasi izvedeni utiskivanjem školjki, vezan je za Dalmaciju. Od nalazišta u istočnoj Hercegovini jedino je nalazište Čairi u Stolcu vezano za ukrasni stil raširen u zapadnoj Hercegovini. Dakle, u Hercegovini postoje dvije, a ne jedna varijanta impresso kulture. J. Müller smatra da je varijanta Humine istovremena sa srednjom i kasnom impresso kulturom u Dalmaciji. Takav zaključak u potpunosti je prihvatljiv za varijantu u Hateljskoj i Zelenoj pećini, dok sam za varijantu u zapadnoj Hercegovini skeptičan s takvim zaključkom zbog česte pojave tremolo ukrasa u Obrama I. (svojstvenih III. fazi impresso kulture u Dalmaciji) koji su tu morali doći preko Hercegovine. Varijanta u Hateljskoj i Zelenoj pećini zbog ukrasnog se stila dodiruje s ranom fazom impresso kulture, a gornju granicu određuje početak danilske kulture. Dakle, ta varijanta pripada zreloj fazi s kojom se ujedno završava razvoj impresso kulture u istočnoj Hercegovini, odnosno tu se ne mogu izdvojiti srednja i kasna faza kao u Dalmaciji. Zbog toga nije prihvatljivo vezivanje

početka I. faze Hateljske pećine za prijelaz iz zrele u kasnu fazu impresso kulture.

Iako u Hateljskoj pećini nema srednjoneolitičkog sloja autor se u zaključnim razmatranjima osvrnuo i na to razdoblje. Istaknuo je da su, unatoč sustavnim rekognosciranjima terena, otkrićima novih neolitičkih nalazišta i njihovim iskopavanjima do danas u Hercegovini poznata samo dva nalazišta danilske kulture. To su Zelena pećina i Čairi u Stolcu. U Zelenoj pećini zapravo i ne postoji sloj koji bi pripadao danilskoj kulturi, već je riječ o elementima te kulture (ali nešto izraženijim nego u Hateljskoj pećini) koji se nalaze zajedno s materijalom impresso kulture. Mali broj nalazišta danilske kulture u Hercegovini ne može se više pravdati niskim stupnjem arheološke istraženosti. Autor s pravom smatra da se taj problem treba rješavati interdisciplinarnim istraživanjima.

Faza II. Hateljske pećine pripada kasnom neolitiku i hvarsko-lisičićkoj kulturi i to lisičićkoj varijanti. Iako pripadaju istoj varijanti, razlike između Hateljske pećine i Lisičića ipak postoje. U Hateljskoj je pećini, u odnosu na Lisičiće, sužen repertoar tipova posuda, a najvažnije razlike su u ukrasnom sustavu. U Hateljskoj je pećini ukrasni sustav u potpunoj dominaciji urezanih motiva s pojavom crvene inkrustacije, dok sasvim nedostaju crveni crusted bojani motivi, kakvi postoje u Lisičićima. Još veće razlike u tom smislu postoje prema ukrasnom sustavu II.b faze Ravlića pećine iznad Peć-Mlina kod Gruda, odnosno hvarske varijante.

Autor nije uvijek dosljedan u terminologiji kada su u pitanju tehnike ukrašavanja. Tako na jednom mjestu kaže da su ukrasi u Lisičićima i Ravlića pećini izvedeni slikanjem (str. 114), dok na drugom mjestu kaže bojanjem (str. 183), što može stvoriti zabunu. Zbog toga treba napomenuti da su u Ravlića pećini ukrasi izvedeni slikanjem crvenom bojom, dok je u Lisičićima poznato samo bojanje urezanih motiva ili određenih dijelova posuda.

Autor ističe da u Hercegovini postoje dva različita ukrasna stila hvarsko-lisičićke kulture: jedan u kojem dominiraju slikani ukrasi (Ravlića pećina) i drugi u kojem nema slikanih već samo urezanih ukrasa (Hateljska pećina). Lisičići i II. faza Zelene pećine stoje nekako između njih, ali pokazuju znatno veću podudarnost s Hateljskom pećinom. Prema sadašnjem zapažanju Ravlića pećina je predstavnik ukrasnog stila u zapadnoj, a Hateljska pećina u istočnoj Hercegovini. Autor uočava podudarnost sa stanjem tijekom ranog neolitika, odnosno razlikama u ukrasnom stilu koje postoje između nalazišta impresso kulture u istočnoj i zapadnoj Hercegovini, ali ne iznosi nikakve pretpostavke, jer srednji je neolitik gotovo nepoznat. Ipak, s pravom

smatra da ta prostorna podudarnost različitih ukrasnih stilova tijekom ranog i kasnog neolitika nije slučajna.

U sloju II. faze Hateljske pećine nađen je ulomak fine keramičke posude uvezene iz južne Italije (sl. 9), ali se autor ne izjašnjava kojoj kulturi pripada. Autor kaže da je južnotalijanski uvoz dobro zastupljen na istočnoj jadranskoj obali i poziva se na nalaze iz Markove spilje na otoku Hvaru te Vele i Jakasove spilje na otoku Korčuli (str. 114, bilješka 51). Pri tome on netočno ili neprecizno citira table s ilustracijama u radovima Grge Novaka, tako da ne znamo koje konkretno ulomke posuda iz Markove spilje B. Marijanović smatra južnotalijanskim uvozom, jer svi ulomci na citiranim tablama to sasvim sigurno nisu. Ulomci bojanog i slikanog posuda iz Vele i Jakasove spilje, za koje autor smatra da su uvoz, nađeni su u slojevima jedne nedovoljno istražene srednjoneolitičke kulture koja se prostirala u južnoj Dalmaciji, a bila je pod kulturnim utjecajima iz južne Italije (Benac 1987, 14). Zbog toga je, zasada, na ta dva nalazišta nesigurno izdvajanje keramike uvezene iz južne Italije od fine domaće.

Faza II. Hateljske pećine suvremena je s Lisičićima i II.b fazom Ravlića pećine, što znači da pripada klasičnoj hvarsko-lisičićkoj kulturi. Gornju granicu II. faze Hateljske pećine određuje ulomak posude ukrašen kanelurama koje su dominantna ukrasna pojava u kasnoj hvarsko-lisičićkoj kulturi koja pripada ranom eneolitiku. Taj ulomak upućuje na početak onog razvojnog procesa koji se na prostoru hvarsko-lisičićke kulture odvija neposredno na prijelazu iz neolitika u eneolitik. Taj proces obilježava degeneracija ili raspadanje ukrasnog sustava i eneolitizacija hvarsko-lisičićke kulture, što je izuzetno dobro dokumentirano u I. fazi Lazaruše. Keramičko posude s tog nalazišta pokazuje sva tehnološka i tipološka obilježja hvarsko-lisičićke kulture, ali je bez ukrasa svojstvenih za tu kulturu. Svega dva ulomka ukrašena kanelurama, premda imaju obilježja neolitičke tehnologije i nedvojbeno pripadaju domaćoj keramičkoj proizvodnji, tipološki su vezana za Bujanj-Salčuđa kulturu. Za tu je kulturu jednim dijelom vezana i pojava kaneliranog posuda u kasnoj hvarsko-lisičićkoj kulturi. Uvođenje novih pojava u domaću keramičku proizvodnju, a vezanih uglavnom za ukrašavanje, nije ništa drugo nego proces eneolitizacije autohtonog supstrata. Proces kulturnog oblikovanja ranog eneolitika odvijao se bez ikakve značajnije prisutnosti novog stanovništva i ima karakter transformiranja autohtonog supstrata. Faza I. Lazaruše trajala je samo do početka ranog eneolitika što potvrđuje nedostatak drugih obilježja kasne hvarsko-lisičićke kulture, kao i sterilni sloj između I. i II. faze.

Najznačajniji rezultati provedenih istraživanja jesu oni koji se tiču razvijenog eneolitika čiji su slojevi otkriveni na sva tri nalazišta. Tom razdoblju pripada I. faza Guvnina, III. faza Hateljske pećine i II. faza Lazaruše. Ta se tri nalazišta sjajno dopunjavaju i međusobno i s drugim istovremenim nalazištima u jugoistočnoj Europi, tako da je autor napravio izvrsne komparacije i uglavnom izvukao čvrste zaključke.

Dominantna pojava u I. fazi Guvnina jest žlijebljena keramika, dok su sekundarne pojave samo dva ulomka posuda ukrašena stilom ljubljanske kulture i ulomak posude s prstenasto zadebljanim obodom na vanjskoj strani. Žlijebljena je keramika na istočnoj jadranskoj obali i u njezinom zaleđu nađena na više nalazišta. Autor ističe da su Guvnine dosada jedino nalazište na tom području gdje je žlijebljena keramika dominantna pojava, dok je na svim drugim nalazištima, osim u Lazaruši, ona skromno zastupljena. Na polovici nalazišta na kojima se pojavljuje udružena je s vrpčastoukrašenom (dalje samo vrpčasta) keramikom. Suprotno tome, posude s prstenasto zadebljanim obodom na drugim su nalazištima dominantna pojava, dok su na Guvninama potvrđene samo s jednim primjerkom. Žlijebljena keramika nije autohtonog porijekla. Najbliže analogije ima na istovremenim nalazištima i u kulturama u donjem Podunavlju i na istočnom Balkanu, gdje je redovito udružena s vrpčastom keramikom. Zbog toga porijeklo žlijebljene keramike na istočnoj jadranskoj obali i u njezinom zaleđu treba tražiti na istočnom Balkanu. Potpunu dominaciju žlijebljene keramike na Guvninama nije moguće objasniti kao jednostavnu posljedicu kulturnih utjecaja, već samo kroz prisutnost sasvim novog stanovništva na tom području. Guvnine je najvjerojatnije naseljavala mala zajednica nomadskih stočara koja je to mjesto privremeno zaposjela, a zatim ga, primjereno prirodi svoje ekonomije, dosta brzo i napustila. Takvo rješenje ne podrazumijeva nikakve velike migracije i doseljavanje velike mase novog stanovništva na to područje u eneolitik. Prisutnost novog stanovništva, bez obzira koliko ono bilo malobrojno, ima iznimno značenje, jer iz njihovih je privremenih naselja moglo doći do širenja ograničenog utjecaja na domaće stanovništvo i obratno. To bi bio i smisao odnosa primarnih i sekundarnih pojava na Guvninama, odnosno većem broju ostalih eneolitičkih naselja.

Suprotno Guvninama, kulturna slika III. faze Hateljske pećine vrlo je složena, a određuje ju više komponenata. Dominantne komponente te faze jesu: lonci s prstenasto zadebljanim obodom i zdjele s proširenim i unutra koso odsječenim obodom. Lonci s prstenasto zadebljanim obodom rezultat su

autohtonog razvoja iz ranog eneolitika. Suprotno njima, zdjele s proširenim i koso odsječnim obodom, unatoč nesumnjivo lokalnoj proizvodnji, nisu autohtonog porijekla, već je porijeklo tog tipa na istočnom Balkanu i u donjem Podunavlju. Sekundarne komponente jesu: "rana cetinska" keramika, keramika ljubljanskog stila i barbotinska keramika. Sve komponente pojavljuju se zajedno kroz cijeli sloj III. faze.

Autor pripisuje ranoj cetinskoj keramici malobrojne posude ukrašene uspravnim gusto poredanim crtama na vratu, horizontalnim mrežasto šrafiranim trakama na ramenu i nizovima okomitih cik-cak motiva na ručkama i oko njih (sl. 16 i 17; t. 31: 3; t. 34: 1-3). On ističe da je riječ samo o elementima rane cetinske kulture i da je ta keramika lokalni proizvod. On smatra da elementi rane cetinske kulture u III. fazi Hateljske pećine ne znače i izravnu prisutnost njezinih nositelja, već su rezultat određenih kontakata s lokalnim stanovništvom, a posljedica tih kontakata mogla je biti i obostrana razmjena ideja u ukrašavanju posuda. To objašnjava činjenicom da je matično područje cetinske kulture u Dalmatinskoj zagori i da su se nositelji te kulture bavili sezonskim stočarstvom i na taj način boravili u krajevima koje nisu intenzivno zaposjeli. Međutim, takav zaključak nije uvjerljiv iz nekoliko razloga. Prvo, sva nalazišta cetinske kulture izvan njezinog matičnog područja pripadaju ranom brončanom dobu. Drugo, glavni kriterij za izdvajanje rane cetinske kulture su oblici posuda, a ne ukrasi (Marović - Čović 1983, 196-197). Treće, ukrasi na "ranoj cetinskoj" keramici u osnovi su stariji od početka cetinske kulture (Čović 1977, 49), a njihova kasnija i ograničena pojava u toj brončanodobnoj kulturi zapravo je eneolitičko nasljeđe. Na neopravdanost autorovog izdvajanja eneolitičke faze cetinske kulture i njegove "rane cetinske" keramike osvrnut ću se malo kasnije.

Keramika ukrašena stilom ljubljanske kulture malobrojna je skupina nalaza; zastupljena je u svim dijelovima sloja III. faze i pripada domaćoj proizvodnji. Ljubljanska kultura nije postojala na istočnoj jadranskoj obali i u njezinom zaleđu kao samostalna i kompaktna kultura, već je riječ samo o njezinim elementima usvojenim od domaćeg stanovništva. Zbog toga autor opravdano upotrebljava naziv keramika ljubljanskog tipa, iako smatram da je ispravnije upotrebljavati naziv keramika ljubljanskog stila, jer prvenstveno je riječ o preuzimanju ukrasnog sustava.

Porijeklo barbotinske keramike jest u vučedolskoj kulturi. Jasno je da na temelju samo tih nalaza u Hateljskoj pećini ne može biti govora o prisutnosti vučedolske kulture, već samo o jednoj komponenti

koja je primarno vezana za nju. Vučedolska kultura nije postojala na istočnoj jadranskoj obali i u njezinom zaleđu kao samostalna i kompaktna kultura, već je riječ samo o njezinim elementima koji su posljedica određenih kontakata s autohtonim stanovništvom u graničnim dijelovima dva kulturna područja.

Kulturna slika II. faze Lazaruše također je vrlo složena, a određuje ju više komponenata. Najbrojnija komponenta jest žlijebljena keramika. Razlike između žlijebljene keramike u Lazaruši i one na Guvninama jesu u organizaciji ukrasa koji su u Lazaruši znatno složeniji i najvećim dijelom sastoje se od nizova alternativno postavljenih i redovito šrafiranih trokuta, dok na Guvninama apsolutno dominira linearnost i motiva i kompozicija.

Druga važna komponenta jest vrpčasta keramika. Na istočnoj jadranskoj obali i u njezinom zaleđu vrpčasta je keramika dosada bila nađena na nekoliko nalazišta, ali uvijek s vrlo malim brojem primjeraka. Autor ističe da je Lazaruša nalazište sa, zasada, najvećim brojem nalaza vrpčaste keramike na sjeverozapadnom Balkanu (str. 158). Ipak, treba napomenuti da je i tu riječ o svega nekoliko ulomaka od ukupno pet posuda od kojih vrpčasti ukras na jednoj posudi nije samostalan već je kombiniran sa žigosanim trokutima. Zbog uloge vrpčaste keramike u istraživanju širenja stepskog stanovništva iz istočne Europe i procesa indoeuropeizacije, autor je nalazima iz Lazaruše opravdano posvetio veliku pozornost. Na istočnoj jadranskoj obali i u njezinom zaleđu vrpčasta je keramika nađena u naseljima, ali i u tumulima sa stepskim načinom pokopavanja. Na tom su području izdvojene dvije faze s vrpčastom keramikom: za stariju je svojstvena tehnika namotane vrpce, a za mlađu tehnika upletene vrpce. Vrpčasta keramika starije faze nađena je samo u naseljima u Pelagoniji, dok vrpčasta keramika na ostalim nalazištima, uključujući i Lazarušu, pripada mlađoj fazi. Nalazišta mlađe vrpčaste keramike u jugoistočnoj Europi koncentrirana su na istočnom Balkanu, na istočnoj jadranskoj obali i u njezinom zaleđu i u srednjoj Grčkoj. Na centralnom Balkanu vrpčasta keramika nije poznata. Autor ispravno zaključuje da je put kojim je vrpčasta keramika s istočnog Balkana dospjela na istočnu jadransku obalu išao preko egejske Makedonije o čemu svjedoči takva keramika, ali i keramika "jadranskog eneolitika" u Dikili Tashu u južnom dijelu doline rijeke Drame. Sada je jasno kojim su putem dospjeli i drugi elementi s istočnog Balkana, prije svega žlijebljena keramika. Zbog malobrojnosti nalaza vrpčaste keramike na istočnoj jadranskoj obali i u njezinom zaleđu, i nedvojbeno lokalnom kontekstu kojem pripadaju, nije moguće dokazati bilo kakav oblik kulturnog i etničkog preslojavanja autohtonog supstrata.

Međutim, to nikako ne isključuje mogućnost doseljavanja manjih skupina novog stanovništva na to područje u razvijenom eneolitiku. Autor svoje izlaganje o vrpčastoj keramici završava sljedećim zaključkom: *“Dakle, ne isključujući potpuno svaku mogućnost prisutnosti manjih skupina nositelja vrpčaste keramike na širem prostoru jadranskog zaleđa, nalaze tog tipa u Lazaruši ipak sam skloniji promatrati kao posljedicu stanovitog oblika kulturnih utjecaja. U tom kontekstu ti nalazi više ne žive pokraj lokalnih kultura, već su njihov integralni dio”* (str. 172). Takav zaključak automatski vrijedi i za žlijebljenu keramiku u Lazaruši. Poslije nekoliko stranica autor će iznijeti nešto drukčije mišljenje na što ću se još osvrnuti.

Manje brojne komponente jesu: lonci s prstenasto zadebljanim obodom, keramika ljubljanskog stila, “rana cetinska” keramika i barbotinska keramika. Nekoliko posuda ukrašeno je stilom kostolačke i vučedolske kulture, ali predstavljaju domaće proizvode.

Zasada jedinstven eneolitički nalaz na istočnoj jadranskoj obali i u njezinom zaleđu predstavlja poklopac s punom okruglom ručkom na sredini ukrašen trokutima ispunjenim gustim ubodima s bijelom inkrustacijom (sl. 9). Autor zaključuje da analogije tom poklopcu treba tražiti izvan tog prostora, ali nije našao odgovarajuće pojave. Zbog toga moram upozoriti da su takvi poklopci nađeni u Bugarskoj, posebno u Ezerovu II. kod Varne. Često imaju vrpčaste ukrase na sebi (Tončeva 1981, Fig. 12: 8-13; Fig. 14: 12), a jedan poklopac čak ima ukrase slične onima na primjerku iz Lazaruše (Roman *et al.* 1992, t. 45: 1). Dakle, poklopac iz Lazaruše pripada istočnobalkanskoj komponenti.

Na nekoliko se posuda nalazi bijela inkrustacija. Autor smatra da je tehnika inkrustiranja u Lazarušu prenesena iz kostolačke ili vučedolske kulture (str. 173-174). Takav zaključak nije prihvatljiv, jer inkrustacija je poznata i u Dikili Tashu i na nalazištima s vrpčastom keramikom na istočnom Balkanu (Roman *et al.* 1992, 61, 67-68, 93-94), a skoro sve inkrustirane posude iz Lazaruše pripadaju istočnobalkanskoj komponenti!

Autor na kraju izlaganja kaže da je u II. fazi Lazaruše *“kulturna slika vrlo složena, a određuje ju više komponenata koje su već poznate s drugih nalazišta razvijenog eneolitika istočnog Jadrana i njegova zaleđa. U tom se smislu i ova faza Lazaruše sasvim dobro uklapa u opće razvojne procese, ali pokazuje i stanovite osobitosti koje se očituju u nešto drukčijim međusobnim odnosima pojedinih zastupljenih komponenata. To se, prije svega, odnosi na vrlo dobro zastupljenu žlijebljenu i vrpčastu keramiku na temelju kojih je moguće pomišljati i na stanovit udio novih populacija u formiranju njezina izraza, premda je*

teško kazati o kojem se obliku sudjelovanja u tom smislu ovdje radi: izravnom ili neizravnom. S druge strane, ni ostale komponente - nalazi cetinskog tipa, ljubljanskog tipa, posude s prstenasto zadebljanim obodima, zdjele s koso zasječenim obodima - ne pokazuju jako velika odstupanja od njihove uobičajene zastupljenosti na drugim nalazištima. Ta činjenica ostavlja mogućnost pomišljanju o stanovitom obliku simbioze autohtonih i novih elemenata” (str. 177). Zaključak da manje brojne komponente u Lazaruši ne pokazuju jako veliko odstupanje od njihove uobičajene zastupljenosti na drugim nalazištima u suprotnosti je s činjenicom koju je sam autor istaknuo na nekoliko mjesta u toj knjizi. Naime, u Lazaruši je nađen samo jedan ulomak lonca s prstenasto zadebljanim obodom, a to je najbrojnija komponenta na drugim nalazištima, izuzev Guvnina. To nam govori da je ipak riječ o izravnom sudjelovanju novog stanovništva u stvaranju složene kulturne slike u Lazaruši, kao i to da je novo stanovništvo imalo veći udio od autohtonog, barem na početku tog procesa. Zajednica koja je naseljavala Lazarušu bila je suviše mala za odvijanje tako složenog procesa i zato pretpostavljam da je bila dio veće organizirane zajednice. Važno je napomenuti da u Lazaruši nisu zastupljene zdjele s proširenim i koso odsječenim obodom, koje su druga komponenta po brojnosti na ostalim nalazištima, izuzev Guvnina. Njihovo spominjanje na kraju izlaganja sigurno je samo previd, jer autor ne donosi njihove crteže niti ih navodi u svom iscrpnom opisu keramičkih nalaza.

Autor na nekoliko mjesta u knjizi opet argumentirano upozorava da se eneolitik na istočnoj jadranskoj obali i u njezinom zaleđu može podijeliti samo na dvije razvojne faze od kojih mlađa faza u kronološkom smislu zauzima vrijeme koje odgovara srednjem i kasnom eneolitiku u njegovoj klasičnoj podjeli, ali je za njezino obilježavanje najprihvatljiviji naziv razvijeni eneolitik. Tu fazu obilježavaju dvije primarne i nekoliko sekundarnih komponenata. Primarne jesu: lonci s prstenasto zadebljanim obodom i zdjele s proširenim i unutra koso odsječenim obodom. Sekundarne jesu: keramika ljubljanskog stila, vučedolska keramika, žlijebljena keramika i vrpčasta keramika. Autor smatra sekundarnom komponentom i “ranu cetinsku” keramiku, ali ja sam je sklon smatrati primarnom komponentom na što ću se još osvrnuti. Primarnim komponentama pripada preko 70% keramičkih nalaza, dok ostatak pripada sekundarnim. Unatoč većem broju komponenata, ta je faza sasvim kompaktna cjelina, a stratigrafski podatci ne dopuštaju nikakvu njezinu podjelu. Sekundarne komponente nemaju vrijednost samostalnih i kompaktnih kultura na tom području i ne dopuštaju

mogućnost masovnog prodora novog stanovništva. Ipak, koncentracija žlijebljene keramike na Guvninama i u Lazaruši, kao i vrpčaste keramike na potonjem nalazištu, dopušta prisutnost pojedinačnih i manjih skupina novog stanovništva na tom području koje zbog brojčane inferiornosti nije moglo izvršiti ni kulturno ni etničko preslojavanje autohtonog supstrata. To također potvrđuju i tumuli sa stepskim načinom pokopavanja. Autor zaključuje da *“unatoč većem broju kulturnih komponenti, vezanih za različita područja Balkana i Panonije, osnovni nositelj kulturnog razvoja ovog stupnja eneolitika i dalje ostaje autohtoni supstrat, točnije nositelji hvarskolisitičke kulture kasnog neolitika, koji krajem tog razdoblja prapovijesti postupno gube svoj raniji identitet, ali, ipak, ne proživljavaju proces nestajanja nego, naprotiv, proces transformiranja u novi kulturni izraz, najprije tijekom ranog a zatim i razvijenog eneolitika”* (str. 186). Takav zaključak u potpunosti je prihvatljiv.

Budući da sekundarne komponente nisu samostalne i kompaktne kulture, postavlja se pitanje je li horizont razvijenog eneolitika zasebna kultura. Autor se do danas nije izjasnio u tom pogledu.

Tipovi posuda i ukrasi izvorno vezani za istočnu jadransku obalu, kao i činjenica da su elementi drugih kultura usvojeni od domaćeg stanovništva, govore nam da horizont razvijenog eneolitika ipak predstavlja zasebnu kulturu, bez obzira što je ta kultura uglavnom kompilatorska i što se ne može vremenski podijeliti, a dugotrajna je pojava. To je i najveća zanimljivost te kulture. Dakle, ostaje još samo pitanje njezinog naziva u čijem traženju nemamo neki veliki izbor, jer ni jedno istraženo nalazište ne pokazuje potpuni sadržaj te kulture, niti se može smatrati privlačnijim od drugih nalazišta. Prije 40-ak godina je Paola Korošec taj horizont nazvala jadranskom skupinom, odnosno kulturom, i smatram da je taj naziv i danas najprimjereniji (Korošec 1962, 213-238). Naravno, sadržaj te kulture puno je složeniji nego što ga je P. Korošec tada definirala. Nazivu jadranska kultura ne proturiječi ni terminologija u talijanskoj arheologiji, jer ni jedna prethistorijska kultura u Italiji nije tako nazvana.

Također se postavlja pitanje kakav je odnos jadranske prema cetinskoj kulturi. Autor zastupa mišljenje da je cetinska kultura nastala još u eneolitiku. Ivan Marović i Borivoj Čović ranu su cetinsku kulturu stavili na završetak eneolitika i na prijelaz u rano brončano doba. Za razliku od njih, autor smatra da rana cetinska kultura pripada razvijenom eneolitiku (str. 120-121, 131). On je, u jednom radu kojeg je napisao poslije, ali objavio prije knjige, objasnio kako cetinska kultura u eneolitičkoj fazi ne može biti samostalna pojava, već je ona još uvijek integralni dio razvijenog

eneolitika na istočnoj jadranskoj obali i u njezinom zaleđu. Odnosno, sve što je svojstveno za razvijeni eneolitik to je svojstveno i za eneolitičku fazu cetinske kulture (Marijanović 1998, 6-7)!

Ako eneolitička faza cetinske kulture nije samostalna pojava, po kojem onda kriteriju nju možemo izdvojiti od jadranske kulture? Ispada da je jedini kriterij vezanost nekih nalazišta iz razvijenog eneolitika za Dalmatinsku zagoru, odnosno za područje u kojem će se cetinska kultura razvijati u rano brončano doba, a to nije prihvatljivo. Zaista nije logično da nalazišta iz razvijenog eneolitika u Hercegovini, na dalmatinskim otocima i u Hrvatskom primorju pripadaju jednoj kulturi, a da nalazišta u Dalmatinskoj zagori, koja je geografski u sredini, pripadaju drugoj kulturi koja uz to nije ni samostalna. Iz izloženog možemo zaključiti da je cetinska kultura ipak nastala početkom brončanog doba, ali je izrasla iz eneolitičkog supstrata. Dakle, kratkotrajna I. faza te kulture pripada ranom brončanom dobu. Budući da ukrasi svojstveni za “eneolitičku fazu cetinske kulture” nemaju svoje analogije izvan istočnojadranskog područja treba ih, zasada, smatrati izvornim ukrasnim stilom jadranske kulture.

Zadržao bih se još malo na cetinskoj kulturi. U sloju III. faze Hateljske pećine zaista su nađena dva ulomka keramike svojstvena cetinskoj kulturi (sl. 28; t. 32: 2), ali ih autor začudo nije vezao za nju i nije im posvetio posebnu pozornost. Ukrasi na tim ulomcima razlikuju se od ukrasa na keramici koju je autor pripisao “eneolitičkoj fazi cetinske kulture”. Ta dva ulomka svojstvena su II. fazi cetinske kulture po periodizaciji I. Marovića i B. Čovića - fazi koja inače pripada ranom brončanom dobu. Autor za ulomak na t. 32: 2 kaže da pripada samom završetku III. faze Hateljske pećine. Stratigrafija u Hateljskoj pećini govori nam da ta faza u kronološkom smislu pokriva i stariji dio ranog brončanog doba pa to objašnjava pojavu tih ulomaka u mlađem dijelu te faze. Dakle, samo za ta dva ulomka iz sloja III. faze možemo pretpostaviti da su rezultat stočarskih kretanja nositelja cetinske kulture i njihovih kontakata sa stanovništvom Hateljske pećine.

Istraživanja su dala značajne rezultate i za poznavanje ranog i srednjeg brončanog doba, odnosno posuške kulture.

Faza IV.a Hateljske pećine pripada mlađem dijelu ranog brončanog doba ili II. fazi posuške kulture. Autor ističe da u Hateljskoj pećini postoji kontinuitet između III. i IV.a faze i da je hijatus koji odgovara starijem dijelu ranog brončanog doba, odnosno I. fazi posuške kulture, samo prividan. Autor ispravno zaključuje da III. faza u razvojnem smislu pripada

razvijenom eneolitiku, a u kronološkom smislu pokriva i dio ranog brončanog doba, i to upravo onaj dio koji odgovara I. fazi posuške kulture. To potvrđuju i dva maloprije spomenuta ulomka keramike koja pripadaju II. fazi cetinske kulture. Autor smatra da je razvijeni eneolitik u Hateljskoj pećini djelomično trajao i tijekom ranog brončanog doba zbog samog procesa formiranja posuške kulture koji se odvijao na nešto užem prostoru od onog koji joj je pripadao u kasnijem razvoju, ali se u ta pitanja dalje ne upušta (str. 132). Na taj problem osvrnut ću se malo kasnije.

U sloju IV.a faze Hateljske pećine nađen je ulomak posude ukrašen žlijebljenim koncentričnim krugovima praćenim nizom uboda (sl. 30). Autor smatra da je riječ o eneolitičkoj tradiciji, ali u razvojnom kontekstu koji obilježava Hateljsku pećinu (str. 133-134). Takav zaključak dovode u sumnju dvije činjenice. Prvo, u sloju III. faze Hateljske pećine nađen je samo jedan ulomak posude ukrašen žlijebljenjem (sl. 28), ali je motiv pravolinijski, a ta je posuda, kako sam rekao, svojstvena cetinskoj kulturi. Drugo, ukrasi žlijebljenim koncentričnim krugovima praćenim nizom uboda zastupljeni su i u cetinskoj kulturi u kojoj su naravno eneolitičko nasljeđe (Čović 1983, t. 27: 5; Marović - Čović 1983, t. 31: 3). Prema tome, ukras na ulomku prikazanom na sl. 30 jest eneolitička tradicija, ali ne i tradicija iz III. faze Hateljske pećine. Zbog toga je vjerojatnije da je i taj ulomak rezultat kontakata nositelja cetinske kulture i stanovništva Hateljske pećine, ali u nešto kasnijem vremenu i u drukčijim kulturnim okolnostima.

Faza II. Guvnina i IV.b faza Hateljske pećine pripadaju srednjem brončanom dobu, odnosno kasnoj posuškoj kulturi. Upravo su ta dva nalazišta i omogućila definiranje kasne posuške kulture.

Veliku novost za srednje brončano doba u Hercegovini predstavlja složeni obrambeni sustav gradine Guvnina. Sudeći po nekim oblicima ručki na posudu koji imaju analogije na Velikoj gradini u Varvari kod Prozora, gradina Guvnine osnovana je početkom srednjeg brončanog doba, a nema dokaza da je bila naseljena do početka kasnog brončanog doba. Autor navodi da u široj okolici gradine Guvnina postoji još nekoliko istovremenih gradina zaštićenih kamenim bedemima od kojih joj je najbližnja Jasočka gradina kod Crnića.

Srednje brončano doba na sjeverozapadnom Balkanu bilo je mirno razdoblje kada je stanovništvo pretežito živjelo u ravničarskim naseljima i pećinama. U grobovima je oružje vrlo rijetko, a ostave nam nisu poznate. Većina gradina naseljenih u rano brončano doba napuštena je. Na rijetkim gradinama nastavio se život i u srednje brončano doba, ali

nisu bile zaštićene bedemima. Izuzetak je Istra gdje je u srednje brončano doba osnovano nekoliko gradina zaštićenih kamenim bedemima, a kako to sada doznajemo, slična je situacija i u istočnoj Hercegovini.

Autor ne objašnjava zašto je u istočnoj Hercegovini u srednje brončano doba došlo do osnivanja gradina zaštićenih kamenim bedemima. Najvjerojatniji razlog jest taj da je nemirno razdoblje izazvano pomicanjem stanovništva započeto u rano brončano doba, u istočnoj Hercegovini trajalo i početkom srednjeg brončanog doba, da bi tek poslije toga došlo do stabilizacije odnosno do mirnog života.

U sloju IV.b faze Hateljske pećine nađena su dva ulomka finih keramičkih posuda radenih na lončarskom kolu i obojanih crvenom i tamnosmeđom bojom (sl. 34 i 35), koje su sasvim sigurno strana pojava u posuškoj kulturi i na zapadnom Balkanu. Ta keramika potječe s područja u kojem je upotreba lončarskog kola već sasvim uobičajena pojava, odnosno s područja mikenske kulture. Iako su ulomci bez izrazitih tipoloških obilježja, kronološki položaj IV.b faze Hateljske pećine prema Grčkoj i položaj tih ulomaka na završetku te faze ne dopušta njihovo vezivanje za vrijeme prije III.a faze kasnoheladskog razdoblja. U novije je vrijeme i na gradini u Škripu na otoku Braču nađeno nekoliko ulomaka od dvije mikenske slikane posude (Gaffney *et al.* 2001, 148, Fig. 7), a na gradini Monkodonji kod Rovinja u Istri također nekoliko ulomaka jedne mikenske posude (Mihovilić *et al.* 2001, 50). Nedavno je Stašo Forenbaher iznio mišljenje da na sjeverozapadnom Balkanu nema uvezenih mikenskih predmeta i doveo je u sumnju mikensko porijeklo dva ulomka keramičke posude s Debelog brda u Sarajevu (Forenbaher 1995, 272-274). Međutim, novi nalazi mikenske keramike iz Hateljske pećine, Škripa i Monkodonje opovrgavaju takvo mišljenje.

Rezultati iskopavanja na tim nalazištima, a posebno u Hateljskoj pećini, još jednom su potvrdili prikaz kulturnog razvoja u eneolitiku i brončanom dobu na istočnoj jadranskoj obali i u njezinom zaleđu koji su u svojim brojnim radovima dali I. Marović, B. Čović i B. Marijanović. Prikazi kulturnog razvoja koje su u novije vrijeme ponudili Blagoje Govedarica i Phillipe Della Casa pokazali su se kao netočni (Govedarica 1989, 199-230; Della Casa 1996, 127-135).

Na kraju knjige autor zaključuje sljedeće: *“Činjenica je, također, da razvojni procesi na prostoru Hercegovine imaju sasvim autohton karakter, pri čemu taj pojam ovdje treba izjednačiti s nositeljima razvoja, odnosno žiteljima koji ga ostvaruju. Ni u jednom razdoblju prapovijesti, naime, na prostoru Hercegovine nije moguće dokazati ne samo promjenu ‘etničke’ slike već ni bilo kakav ozbiljniji priljev novog stanovništva. Razumije*

se, manja populacijska infiltriranja mogu se uočiti, ali nije moguće uočiti da su zbog njih razvojni procesi krenuli bitno drukčijim tokom. Rijetke i malobrojne populacije koje su na ovo područje prodrle, nisu nikada uspjele asimilirati autohtoni supstrat, već su, naprotiv, bile same asimilirane, a njihov se krajnji domet sastojao u unošenju novih elemenata u kulturni sadržaj lokalnog stanovništva. Taj proces, međutim, nije imao karakter nametanja tuđeg stila i kulturnog izraza, već samo selekcije pojedinih njegovih pojava i njihove prilagodbe shvaćanju i mentalitetu lokalnog supstrata” (str. 188). Takav zaključak nije prihvatljiv, jer ako ni u jednoj etapi prethistorijskog doba nije bilo masovnog doseljavanja novog stanovništva, kako je onda uopće došlo do potpune indoeuropeizacije tog područja? U željezno doba istočnu Hercegovinu naseljavali su Iliri, a zapadnu Hercegovinu Delmati, a pouzdano znamo da su te etničke zajednice bile indoeuropske. Kada je došlo do masovnog doseljavanja novog stanovništva na istočnu jadransku obalu i u njezino zaleđe? Odgovor na to pitanje dali su B. Čović i Frano Prendi, ali autor je zanemario njihove zaključke (Čović 1977, 55; Prendi 1978, 45; Čović 1986, 64-65; Čović 1991, 27-28). Oni su iznijeli čvrste dokaze da je početkom ranog brončanog doba došlo do snažnog prijeloma u kulturnom razvoju na tom području, što potvrđuje pojava i dominacija novih oblika, ukrasa, pa i tehnologije u izradi keramičkog posuđa. Taj je prijelom mogao biti izazvan samo masovnim doseljenjem novog, brojnog i po organizaciji nadmoćnog stanovništva. B. Čović to je stanovništvo provizorno nazvao “nositeljima grube keramike” označavajući time samo jedan od arheološki najlakše prepoznatljivih elemenata materijalne kulture, zajednički svim skupinama koje su tom stanovništvu pripadale. To stanovništvo, nesumnjivo stočarsko, u posljednjim se stoljećima 3. tisućljeća prije Krista širilo s istočnog Balkana prema drugim dijelovima tog poluotoka. Širenje tog stanovništva valja zamisliti kao lagano kretanje velikog broja manjih društvenih zajednica povezanih nekim daljnjim srodstvom, ponekada, u kraćim razdobljima sjedilačkog života, i labavim međusobnim dodirima. Neke od tih zajednica zaustavile su se ranije, neke su lutale dalje. Oni nisu niti uništili zatečeno autohtono stanovništvo niti su ga pokorili, već su se pomiješali s njim i stvorili nove kulturno-etničke zajednice nesumnjivo već indoeuropske.

Taj je proces dobro dokumentiran i u Hateljskoj pećini, ali autor to nije uočio. Iako postoji kontinuitet između faza III. i IV.a, brojni sasvim novi oblici posuđa upućuju na zaključak da je poslije završetka III. faze nastao snažan prijelom u kulturnom razvoju tog naselja. Sam autor kaže da tipološka obilježja posuđa koja povezuju IV.a fazu s prethodnom fazom

nisu brojna (str. 133). Promjene se mogu objasniti samo dolaskom novog stanovništva na to područje, ali to ne znači da je ono odmah preslojilo autohtono stanovništvo u Hateljskoj pećini. Naime, najveći broj posuda u IV.a fazi izrađen je tehnologijom u eneolitičkoj tradiciji, dok je samo manji broj izrađen tehnologijom koja nije svojstvena eneolitiku. To nam govori da je autohtono stanovništvo i dalje naseljavalo Hateljsku pećinu, ali se prilagodilo novoj situaciji i počelo miješati s doseljenicima. Budući da III. faza u kronološkom smislu pokriva i stariji dio ranog brončanog doba, očito je da je autohtono stanovništvo u Hateljskoj pećini u početku bilo po strani tog procesa, ali je s vremenom podleglo promjenama. U IV.b fazi, u izradi posuđa prevladava tehnologija koja nije u eneolitičkoj tradiciji, tako da možemo zaključiti da se autohtono stanovništvo stopilo s novim i brojnijim stanovništvom, odnosno da je dovršen proces indoeuropeizacije u Hercegovini.

Prema izloženom nema sumnje da su nositelji posuške kulture bili Indoeuropaljani. Suprotno posuškoj kulturi cetinska je kultura genetski vezana za razvijeni eneolitik što znači da su njezini nositelji bili staro mediteransko stanovništvo koje je nesumnjivo bilo djelomično indoeuropeizirano, ali nije bilo indoeuropsko.

Na kraju bih spomenuo to da je uočljivo da autor ne poznaje dovoljno tipologiju kamenog oruđa. Artefakt iz Hateljske pećine prikazan na t. 1: 5 odredio je kao masivni nož, a, koliko se iz crteža može zaključiti, riječ je o strugalu. Dva artefakta iz Lazaruše također je odredio kao noževe što je za primjerak prikazan na t. 1: 1 samo djelomično točno, a za primjerak prikazan na t. 1: 2 nije uopće. Orijentacija artefakata na crtežima je netočna, odnosno prikazani su naopačke. Prvi je primjerak grebalo na sječivu, a drugi strugalo.

Vrijednost knjige umanjena je zbog izostanka analiza prirodnih znanstvenih disciplina. Tako nije izvedena radiokarbonska (C-14) analiza ni jednog uzorka ugljena, palinološke analize uzoraka zemlje i petrografske analize kamenih artefakata. Osteološke analize životinjskih kostiju izveo je sam autor, ali te su analize površne i nestručne.

Iznio bih i nekoliko tehničkih primjedbi na tu knjigu. Ilustracije u toj knjizi nisu numerirane u kontinuitetu, već za svaku tematsku cjelinu zasebno, što će stvarati teškoće posebno prilikom budućeg citiranja tabla. U bibliografiji nema nekoliko radova koji su u bilješkama citirani kraticama tako da je određenje njihovih naslova otežano (vidjeti bilješke 57, 58 i 59 u podnaslovu *Guvnine*, bilješke 62 i 63 u podnaslovu *Hateljska pećina* i bilješku 30 u podnaslovu *Lazaruša*). Tiskarna Zrinski u Čakovcu, kojoj je povjereno tiskanje knjige, nije najkvalitetnije

obavila svoj zadatak, jer ilustracije su pripremane slabom kompjuterskom opremom ili su posao obavile nedovoljno sposobne osobe. Tako su reprodukcije crnobijelih fotografija izišle pretamne ili presvijetle, a reprodukcije izvrsnih crteža lošije od izvornika što se jasno vidi po izlomljenim crtama. Nažalost, to je česta pojava u tiskarskoj praksi u Hrvatskoj

posljednjih 10-ak godina.

Bez obzira na neslaganja oko nekih pitanja, knjiga je kapitalno djelo trajne vrijednosti i nezaobilazna je za poznavanje neolitika, eneolitika i bronzanog doba na istočnoj jadranskoj obali i u njezinom zaleđu. Mislim da ne pretjerujem ako kažem da knjiga ide u sam vrh prethistorijske arheologije u jugoistočnoj Europi.

- BENAC, A. 1987, Kulturni odnosi sjeverozapadnog Balkana i talijanske oblasti Tavoliere u neolitsko doba. - *Arh. rad. raspr.* 10, 11-23.
- ČOVIĆ, B. 1977, Velika gradina u Varvari - I dio (slojevi eneolita, ranog i srednjeg bronzanog doba). - *Glas. Zem. muz. Arheol.* 32, 5-175.
- ČOVIĆ, B. 1983, Regionalne grupe ranog bronzanog doba. - U: *Praist. jug. zem. 4. Bronzano doba*, 114-190.
- ČOVIĆ, B. 1986, Die Ethnogenese der Illyrier aus der Sicht der Vor- und Frühgeschichte. - U: *Ethnogenese europäischer Völker*, 55-74, Gustav Fischer Verlag, Stuttgart, New York.
- ČOVIĆ, B. 1991, *Pod kod Bugojna. Naselje bronzanog i željeznog doba u centralnoj Bosni. 1. Rano bronzano doba*. - Sarajevo.
- DELLA CASA, P. 1996, *Velika Gruda II. Die bronzzeitliche Nekropole Velika Gruda (Opš. Montenegro)*. - *Univforsch. z. prähist. Arch.* 33.
- FORENBAHER, S. 1995, Trade and Exchange in Late Bronze and Early Iron Age Croatia. - U: *Handel, Tausch und Verkehr im Bronze- und Früheisenzeitlichen Südosteuropa*, Prähistorische Archäologie in Südosteuropa 11, 271-282, Berlin.
- GAFFNEY, V., S. ČAČE, B. KIRIGIN, P. LEACH, N. VUJNOVIĆ, K. i D. WARDLE 2001, Enclosure and Defence: the Context of Mycenaean Contact within Central Dalmatia. - U: *Defensive settlements of the Aegean and the Eastern Mediterranean after c. 1200 B.C.*, 137-156, Nicosia.
- GOVEDARICA, B. 1989, *Rano bronzano doba na području istočnog Jadrana*. - *Djela ANUBiH* 67, Cen. balk. isp. 7.

Brunislav Marijanović: *Contributions for the Prehistory of the Hinterland of the Adriatic Coast*. Monographs 2. Faculty of Philosophy Zadar, Split University. Zadar 2000. 237 pages, 50 figures, 11 illustrations and 81 plates.

The book I am about to review is work by Brunislav Marijanović, professor of prehistoric archaeology and archaeological methodology at the Faculty of Philosophy (Faculty of Arts and Letters) in Zadar, who has dedicated the last 25 years to research into the Neolithic, Eneolithic (Chalcolithic) and Bronze Ages on the eastern Adriatic coast and its hinterland. The book contains the results of archaeological excavations at three prehistoric sites in eastern Herzegovina which the author conducted while working as an archaeologist at the National Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina (*Zemaljski muzej Bosne i Hercegovine*) in Sarajevo. The book was published in the Croatian language but with an extensive summary in English, so that it is accessible to a broad circle of archaeologists. The book's title draws immediate attention because it is not sufficiently precise, for it covers the sites on the eastern Adriatic coast and only in its southern hinterland.

The book consists of a brief foreword, three thematic units, concluding remarks, a bibliography and an English-language summary. The majority of the text encompasses the three thematic units which contain the results of research conducted at the hillfort settlement of Guvnine, and Hateljska Pećina (pećina - *eng. cave*) and Lazaruša cave, respectively. The thematic units consist of several chapters, so that each one can stand alone

- KOROŠEC, P. 1962, Neka pitanja oko eneolita Dalmacije. - *Arh. rad. raspr.* 2, 213-238.
- MARIJANOVIĆ, B. 1980-1981, Ravlića pećina (Peć-Mlini). - *Glas. Zem. muz. Arheol.* 35/36, 1-97.
- MARIJANOVIĆ, B. 1997, Cetinska kultura - rana faza, samostalna kultura ili integralni dio eneolitika. - *Rad. Fil. fak. u Zadru. Raz. povij. znan.* 23, 1-8.
- MAROVIC, I. i B. ČOVIĆ 1983, Cetinska kultura. - U: *Praist. jug. zem. 4. Bronzano doba*, 191-231.
- MIHOVILIĆ, K., B. TERŽAN, B. HÄNSEL, D. MATOŠEVIĆ i C. BECKER 2001, *Rovinj vor den Römern*. - Oetker-Voges Verlag, Kiel.
- MÜLLER, J. 1991, Die ostadriatische Impresso-Kultur: Zeitliche Gliederung und kulturelle Einbindung. - *Germania* 69/2, 311-358.
- MÜLLER, J. 1994, *Das ostadriatische Frühneolithikum. Die Impresso-Kultur und die Neolithisierung des Adriaumes*. - Prähistorische Archäologie in Südosteuropa 9, Berlin.
- PRENDI, F. 1978 - L'Age du bronze en Albanie. - *Iliria* 7-8, 27-58.
- ROMAN, P., A. DODD-OPRIȚESCU i P. JÁNOS 1992, *Beiträge zur Problematik der schnurverzierten Keramik Südosteuropas*. - Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften Internationale Interakademische Kommission für die Erforschung der Vorgeschichte des Balkans. Monographien 3, Mainz am Rhein.
- TONČEVA, G. 1981, Un habitat lacustre de l'Âge du Bronze ancien dans les environs de la ville de Varna (Ézérovo II). - *Dacia* 25, 41-62.

as a separate study. The text has been very strictly organised and therefore clear. The manuscript was completed in 1991, but the book could not be published until now due to the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina, and the author's sense of moral responsibility to the National Museum in Sarajevo during the war, as well as the shortage of funds in that Museum, which incurred heavy damages during the war. It is important to point out that after completing the manuscript, the author did not incorporate recent works and views by other archaeologists, with the exception of his own works published up to 1994.

The hillfort settlement of Guvnine is located on a small elevation above the hamlet of Gagrice, on the territory of the village of Lokve near the town of Čapljina. The first test sondage was dug in 1984, while systematic digs were conducted in 1988 and 1989. A total surface area of 330 m² was investigated, which is, given the available surface and the excavation site's state of preservation, an almost optimum research operation. The cultural layer was very thin; the maximum thickness was 0.8 meters. There are two clearly distinct developmental phases at Guvnine. The older belongs to the advanced Eneolithic, while the younger phase belongs to the middle Bronze Age. The Eneolithic settlement was small and short-lived, in contrast to the younger settlement, which was defended by stone fortifications. The Bronze Age settlement occupied the entire surface area of the excavation site and was defended by three rings of dry-wall ramparts. The outer rampart encompassed a space with an approximate area of 180 x 170 meters. Two short embankments

are located in front of the outer rampart; their purpose was to additionally reinforce the eastern- and westernmost perimeters of the hillfort. There is nothing to indicate the gradual expansion of the younger settlement. The hillfort is located in a very fertile zone which offered the possibility of developing diverse economic activities. Nonetheless, completely exact data on the economies in the older and younger settlements are extremely meagre. Even so, the author managed to draw some basic conclusions even in this situation. The size and short-lived nature of the older settlement means that its population had a livestock-raising of nomadic type. The more long-lasting character of the younger settlement and numerous examples of grindstones indicate that the principal economic activity of its population was agriculture, for which the Guvnine environs offer the best conditions. In addition to agriculture, the inhabitants engaged in livestock-raising and hunting.

Hateljjska Pečina is located at the top of a slope on a mountain called Trusina, above the hamlet Hatelji, on the territory of the village of Berkovići near Stolac. The cave covers a surface area of 28 x 20 meters. Only the frontal section of the cave was suitable for human settlement. The test sondage was dug in 1984, while more systematic digs were conducted in 1987 and 1988. A total surface area of 96 m² was investigated, which roughly corresponds to the inhabitable portion of the cave. The thickness of the cultural layers varies from 0.2 meters at the very entrance to approximately 2.8 meters in the interior. Above the youngest cultural layer there is a recent sterile layer which was as thick as 1.4 meters in the interior. Although the author does not explain this, such a thick recent layer is certainly the result of the long use of the cave as an enclosure for livestock. Five developmental phases were discerned in Hateljjska Pečina, of which the first belongs to the Early Neolithic, the second to the Late Neolithic, the third to the Advanced Eneolithic, and the fourth - which can be divided into two sub-phases - to the Early and Middle Bronze Age, while the short fifth phase belongs to the Middle Ages. In the history of the cave's settlement, there were several extended interludes which are confirmed by sterile layers. It is only between the III and IV phases that there is no chronological break, and these two form a stratigraphic whole. Excavations have provided interesting data on the organisation of space and life in the cave, of which only the most important will be cited here: the hearths were placed exclusively at the cave's edges, the central space was used for communication and it had drainage consisting of randomly scattered amorphous stones. During periods of colder weather, the entrance was closed with a wooden construction. The economy of Hateljjska Pečina's inhabitants was based on livestock-raising and hunting, while all other forms of economic activity, including agriculture, played a secondary role.

Lazaruša cave is located in the wider area of the village Dabrica, also near the town of Stolac. The cave is situated in a rather unusual environment created by the narrow canyon of the seasonal Radimlja river. The canyon cuts through several hundred meters of high slopes in the surrounding mountains, so that a narrow band of blue sky can barely be seen between the canyon walls, also overgrown with thick vegetation. The cave has modest dimensions: it is 13 meters long, while its maximum width, at the very entrance, is about 6 meters. The test sondage was conducted in 1984, and then continued more systematically in 1988. A total of 25 m² were investigated. This is, given the cave's usable surface, the optimum possible extent of research operations. The cultural layers reached a thickness of 2.2 meters. Two developmental phases can clearly be distinguished in Lazaruša, of which the older belongs to the transition from the Neolithic to the Eneolithic, while the younger phase belongs to the Advanced Eneolithic. There were two interludes in the cave's settlement history, which is confirmed by sterile layers and diggings in the cultural layer made by wild animals. The older sterile layer corresponds to a longer

period of non-settlement between the two developmental phases, because after this there were great changes in the material culture. The younger sterile layer corresponds to a short-term interruption during the younger developmental phase. The division of the younger phase into two sub-phases only has a formal character, because it is not accompanied by any changes in the material culture. Due to its size, the cave could not accommodate a social unit larger than one family, i.e. 5 to 6 individuals. The author leaves open the question of whether the cave served as a permanent or largely permanent place of residence for precisely such a social unit, or whether it is a matter of a differently organised community tied together by different interests. The cave's inhabitants based their survival on livestock-raising, both sheep and goats breeding, as well as hunting. The cave's immediate surroundings offer no conditions for cultivation, for there is a complete lack of arable land.

In the remainder of the review I shall give an overview of the most important results of the research, and a commentary on some of the author's conclusions. Let us start in chronological order.

Phase I of Hateljjska Pečina belongs to the Early Neolithic and the Impresso culture. The author connected this phase with the Phase III of Zelena Pečina above Blagaj near Mostar. The principal feature of the Impresso culture at these two sites are the very thick rows of stamped and incised decorations which cover the entire surface of the pottery. Decorations made by impressing the edges of shells are lacking in Zelena Pečina, while they are very rare in Hateljjska Pečina. Upon the discovery of Hateljjska Pečina, Zelena Pečina was no longer a lone representative of that specific decorative style, and this gives added value to its categorisation as a representative of a special variant of Impresso culture as discerned by Alojz Benac. Jejinovača cave also belongs to this variant, but this was only an occasional residence in the economic zone of Hateljjska Pečina's inhabitants.

It should be recalled that about twenty years ago B. Marijanović himself questioned the justification of distinguishing a separate variant of the Impresso culture in Zelena Pečina. Since Zelena Pečina is located on a very important communication route that leads to the interior via the Neretva and Buna river valleys through Nevesinjsko Polje (polje - *eng.* field), he believed that the physiognomy of the Impresso culture at this site does not reflect independent and local development, rather it represents a set of elements that ensued from the dynamic and continual movement in its immediate vicinity - but without a more visible impact on the overall development of the Early Neolithic in Herzegovina (Marijanović 1980-1981, 44). In other words, the diversity of the pottery ornamentation in Zelena Pečina is the result of temporary residence by different groups of people at that site during the Early Neolithic period. Hateljjska Pečina, more distant from this communication route, confirmed the justification for distinguishing a special variant of Impresso culture that is tied to eastern Herzegovina.

Approximately 25 % of the total amount of pottery in the Phase I layer of Hateljjska Pečina is monochrome ceramic whose forms approach those of the Danilo culture, but the author emphasises that these are not purely Danilo forms. He also neither explains nor poses the question of whether monochrome ceramics in Hateljjska Pečina signify: a) external influences on the Impresso culture from which the Danilo culture later developed; b) the beginning of the emergence of the Danilo culture from the Impresso culture at this site; c) the result of contacts between the inhabitants of Hateljjska Pečina and the agents of early Danilo culture which began to develop in the vicinity.

A potsherd of barbotine-ware and a potsherd of pottery decorated with a painted spiral motif were found in the Phase I layer of Hateljjska Pečina. The vessels were imported from the Starčevo culture. The author believes that a settlement of mixed Starčevo-Impresso culture in Obre I near Kakanj, in central

Bosnia, played a mediating role in the transfer of this pottery to Hateljska Pećina. However, the author himself says the fact that spiral designs were not observed on the painted Starčevo pottery from Obre I casts doubt on this assumption, but that this circumstance should not have a decisive influence on the value of this assumption, for it is possible that this is a coincidence tied to the surface on which the research was conducted. This assumption does not seem probable to me for other reasons. First, the author has completely overlooked the sites of the Starčevo culture in northern Montenegro, of which the Odmuť cave, near Plužine, located at the border between Starčevo and Impresso culture, is only about 50 km from Hateljska Pećina in a straight line. It is therefore much more likely that these vessels came from some settlement of the Starčevo culture in Montenegro or south-western Serbia. Second, the principal feature of the Impresso component in Obre I is the tremolo decoration which are almost completely absent in Hateljska Pećina. By the same token, the Impresso component in Obre I do not contain designs characteristic of Hateljska Pećina. More than anything else, direct ties between these two settlements would be reflected in the Impresso culture pottery.

The author feels that the chronological position of Phase I of Hateljska Pećina lies between the transition from the advanced to the late phase of Impresso culture and the beginning of Danilo culture (pp. 111-112). The chronological and spatial division of the Impresso culture on the eastern Adriatic coast and its hinterland was exhaustively developed by Johannes Müller in his dissertation (Müller 1994), but it was only published after the completion of Marijanović's manuscript for this book. Nevertheless, even before this, J. Müller published a summary of chronological observations from his dissertation (Müller 1991, 311-358), but B. Marijanović did not even make use of this work in his book. J. Müller categorised all Impresso culture sites in Herzegovina as belonging to a special variant that he referred to as Humine. Such a conclusion cannot be accepted, because the ornamental styles at sites in eastern and western Herzegovina greatly differ from each other. Additionally, the ornamental style of western Herzegovina, although lacking decorations made by impressing shells, is associated with that of Dalmatia. Among the sites in eastern Herzegovina, only the Čairi site in Stolac can be associated with the ornamental style common throughout western Herzegovina. Therefore, in Herzegovina there are two variants of the Impresso culture, rather than just one. J. Müller believes that the Humine variant is contemporaneous with the middle and late Impresso culture in Dalmatia. Such a conclusion is completely acceptable for the variant found in Hateljska Pećina and Zelena Pećina, while in terms of the variant found in western Herzegovina I am sceptical of this conclusion because of the frequent appearance of tremolo decorations in Obre I (characteristic of Phase III of Impresso culture in Dalmatia) which had to come there through Herzegovina. Based on its decorative style, the variant in Hateljska Pećina and Zelena Pećina touches on the early phase of Impresso culture, while the upper limit is determined by the beginning of Danilo culture. This variant therefore belongs to the advanced phase which simultaneously marks the conclusion of Impresso cultural development in eastern Herzegovina, i.e. a middle and late phase cannot be discerned here as in Dalmatia. This is why it is inappropriate to associate the beginning of Hateljska Pećina's Phase I with the transition from the advanced to the late phase of Impresso culture.

Although there is no Middle Neolithic layer in Hateljska Pećina, in his concluding observations the author also deals with this period. He stresses that despite systematic terrain surveys, the discoveries of new Neolithic sites and their excavations, up to the present only two Danilo culture sites are known in Herzegovina. These are Zelena Pećina and Čairi in Stolac. A layer that would belong to the Danilo culture does not in fact exist in Zelena Pećina; these are rather elements of this culture

(but somewhat more marked than in Hateljska Pećina) located together with Impresso culture materials. The small number of Danilo culture sites in Herzegovina can no longer be explained by the low level of archaeological research. The author correctly believes that this problem should be solved by means of interdisciplinary research.

Phase II of Hateljska Pećina belongs to the Late Neolithic and the Hvar-Lisičići culture or, more precisely, to the Lisičići variant. Although they belong to the same variant, there are nonetheless differences between Hateljska Pećina and Lisičići. In relation to Lisičići, the variety of pottery types in Hateljska Pećina is narrower, while the most important differences lie in the decorative system. In Hateljska Pećina the decorative system is dominated by incised motifs with the appearance of red incrustations, while the red crusted colour designs found in Lisičići are completely lacking. In this sense, there are even greater differences in the decorative system of Phase IIb of Ravlića Pećina above Peć-Mlini near Grude, i.e. the Hvar variant.

The author is not always consistent in his use of terminology when dealing with ornamentation techniques. Therefore in one place he says that the decorations in Lisičići and Ravlića Pećina were made by painting (p. 114), while at another place he says dying (p. 183), which causes some confusion. Therefore, it should be noted that the decorations in Ravlića Pećina were made by painting with red dye, while in Lisičići the only known technique was dying incised motifs or specific parts of the pottery.

The author stresses that there are two different decorative styles in the Hvar-Lisičići culture in Herzegovina: one dominated by painted decorations (Ravlića Pećina) and the other in which there are no painted, rather only incision decorations (Hateljska Pećina). Lisičići and Phase II of Zelena Pećina somehow stand between them, but show considerably greater correspondence to Hateljska Pećina. According to current observations, Ravlića Pećina is a representative of the decorative style in western Herzegovina, while Hateljska Pećina is a representative of the decorative style in eastern Herzegovina. The author observes the correspondence with the situation during the Early Neolithic and the differences in decorative styles between the sites of Impresso culture in eastern and western Herzegovina, but he makes no conjectures, because the Middle Neolithic is almost unknown. Nonetheless, he is correct in thinking that the spatial correspondence of differing decorative styles during the Early and Late Neolithic is not coincidental.

A fragment of fine ceramic vessel imported from southern Italy (Fig. 9) was found in Phase II layer of Hateljska Pećina, but the author does not indicate to which culture it belongs. He says that southern Italian imports are well represented on the eastern Adriatic coast and refers to the findings from Markova Spilja (spilja – *eng.* cave) on the island of Hvar and caves Vela Spilja and Jakasova Spilja on the island of Korčula (p. 114, note 51). Here he either incorrectly or imprecisely cites the illustration plates in the works of Grga Novak, so that we do not know which potsherds from Markova Spilja B. Marijanović considers to be southern Italian imports, for all potsherds on these plates certainly are not. Fragments of dyed and painted pottery from Vela Spilja and Jakasova Spilja, considered imports by the author, were found in the layers of an insufficiently investigated Middle Neolithic culture which extended throughout southern Dalmatia and was subject to cultural influences from southern Italy (Benac 1987, 14). Because of this, for now the distinction between ceramics imported from southern Italy and fine local ceramics at these two sites is uncertain.

Phase II of Hateljska Pećina is contemporaneous with Lisičići and Phase IIb of Ravlića Pećina, which means it belongs to the classic Hvar-Lisičići culture. The upper limit for Phase II of Hateljska Pećina is determined by a potsherd decorated with cannellures which are dominant decorative features in the late Hvar-Lisičići culture that belongs to the Early Eneolithic. This fragment indicates the beginning of that developmental process

which proceeded during the transition from Neolithic into Eneolithic in the Hvar-Lisičići culture zone. This process is characterised by a degeneration, or decomposition, and Eneolithisation of the Hvar-Lisičići culture, which is exceptionally well-documented in Phase I of Lazaruša. Ceramic pottery from this site indicates all of the technological and typological features of Hvar-Lisičići culture, but without the decorations specific to this culture. Only two potsherds, decorated with cannelures, although they have the features of Neolithic technology and undoubtedly represent local ceramic production, they are typologically linked with the Bubanj-Salčuța culture. The appearance of cannelure pottery in the late Hvar-Lisičići culture is partially associated with this culture as well. The introduction of new aspects in local ceramic production associated primarily with decoration, is nothing other than the process of Eneolithisation of the indigenous substratum. The process of Early Eneolithic cultural formation proceeded without the notable presence of new inhabitants and it had the character of transforming the indigenous substratum. Phase I of Lazaruša lasted only until the beginning of the Early Eneolithic, which is confirmed by the lack of other features of the late Hvar-Lisičići culture, as well as the sterile layer between Phases I and II.

The most significant results of the research are those that pertain to the advanced Eneolithic. The layers from this period were discovered at all three sites. Phase I of Guvnine, Phase III of Hateljska Pečina and Phase II of Lazaruša all belong to this period. These three sites not only complement each other very well, they also correspond to other contemporary sites in southeastern Europe, so that the author made some excellent comparisons and generally drew firm conclusions.

The dominant phenomenon in Phase I of Guvnine is the grooved-ware ceramics, while a secondary phenomenon is only two potsherds decorated in the style of the Ljubljana culture and a potsherd with a thick collar. Grooved-ware on the eastern Adriatic coast and its hinterland has been found at a number of sites. The author emphasises that Guvnine is until now the only site in this region where grooved-ware are the dominant aspect, while at all other sites, with the exception of Lazaruša, they have only a modest presence. In that half of the site at which it appears, it is joined by corded-ware ceramics. By contrast, vessels with thick collars are a dominant aspect of other sites, while at Guvnine there is only one confirmed example. Grooved-ware is not of indigenous origin. The closest analogy can be found in contemporaneous sites and cultures in the lower Danubian region and in the eastern Balkans, where it is regularly accompanied by corded-ware. Therefore, the origin of grooved-ware on the eastern Adriatic coast and its hinterland should be sought in the eastern Balkans. The complete domination of grooved-ware at Guvnine cannot be explained as a simple consequence of cultural impacts, but rather only through the presence of completely new inhabitants in this area. Guvnine was most likely settled by a small community of nomadic livestock herders who temporarily occupied this place and then, congruent to the nature of their economy, left it rather quickly. Such a solution does not imply any manner of large migrations or the arrival of large masses of new inhabitants to this area during the Eneolithic. The presence of new inhabitants, regardless of how few in number, has exceptional significance, because it is from their temporary settlements that the diffusion of a limited influence on the local population and the reverse could have occurred. This could also account for the relationship between the primary and secondary phenomena at Guvnine and a larger number of other Eneolithic settlements.

As opposed to Guvnine, the cultural physiognomy of Hateljska Pečina's Phase III is very complex and characterised by a number of elements. The dominant components of this phase are: pots with thick collars and bowls with expanded inward diagonally-cut rims. Pots with thick collars are the result of Early Eneolithic indigenous development. In contrast, bowls with expanded inward

diagonally-cut rims, despite their undoubtedly local production, are not of indigenous origin; the origins of this type can rather be found in the eastern Balkans and in the lower Danubian region. Secondary components are: "early Cetina" ceramics, Ljubljana-style ceramics and barbotine-ware ceramics. All components appear jointly throughout the entire Phase III layer.

The author ascribes as early Cetina ceramics a small amount of pottery decorated by dense vertical lines on the neck, cross-hatched interlaced stripes on the shoulder and sheaves of vertical zigzag designs on and around the handles (Fig. 16 and 17; Pl. 31: 3; Pl. 34: 1-3). He stresses that these are solely elements of the early Cetina culture and that these ceramics are a local product. He believes that the early Cetina culture features in Hateljska Pečina's Phase III do not also mean the direct presence of its agents. Rather, he feels they are the result of certain contacts with local inhabitants, and a consequence of such contacts could have been the mutual exchange of ideas in pottery ornamentation. He explains this by pointing out the core region of Cetina culture in the Dalmatinska Zagora (Dalmatian hinterland) and the fact that the agents of this culture were involved in seasonal livestock herding and in this manner resided in areas that they did not actively occupy. Such a conclusion, however, is not convincing for several reasons. First, all Cetina culture sites outside of its core region belong to the Early Bronze Age. Second, the principal criteria for the distinction of early Cetina culture are the pottery forms, not the decorations (Marović - Čović 1983, 196-197). Third, the decorations on "early Cetina" ceramics are in essence older than the beginning of the Cetina culture (Čović 1977, 49), while their subsequent, limited appearance in this Bronze Age culture is actually the Eneolithic heritage. I will deal with the author's lack of grounds for distinguishing the Eneolithic phase of Cetina culture and its "early Cetina" ceramics a little later in this review.

Ceramics decorated in the style of the Ljubljana culture represent a small group of finds, is present in all parts of the Phase III layer and a product of local handiwork. The Ljubljana culture did not exist on the eastern Adriatic coast and its hinterland as an independent and compact culture - only certain features were assumed by the local inhabitants. The author is therefore justified in using the term Ljubljana-type ceramics, although I believe it would have been more accurate to use the term Ljubljana-style ceramics since this is primarily a matter of adopting a decorative system.

The origin of barbotine-ware lies in the Vučedol culture. It is clear that based on these findings alone one cannot speak of the presence of the Vučedol culture, but rather just of one component that is primarily associated with that culture. The Vučedol culture did not exist on the eastern Adriatic coast and its hinterland as an independent and compact culture. Only some of its elements appeared which are the result of some contacts between indigenous inhabitants in the peripheral zones of both cultural regions.

Cultural physiognomy of Lazaruša's Phase II is also quite complex, and it is characterised by many components. The most numerous component is the grooved-ware. The differences between the grooved-ware in Lazaruša and those at Guvnine are in the organisation of decorations. Those at Lazaruša are considerably more complex and largely consist of sequences of alternating and regularly cross-hatched triangles, while at Guvnine the linearity of both design and composition absolutely dominate.

The second important component is corded-ware. Corded-ware on the eastern Adriatic coast and its hinterland were found at several sites, but always with a very small number of examples. The author emphasises that Lazaruša is a site with, for now, the highest number of corded-ware findings in the north-western Balkans (p. 158). Nonetheless, it should be noted that even here it is a matter of only a few fragments of a total of five vessels, among which the corded-ware on one is not independent but rather combined with impressed triangles. Due to the role

of corded-ware in research on the expansion of steppe populations from eastern Europe and the process of Indo-Europeanization, the author correctly dedicated great attention to the findings from Lazaruša. On the eastern Adriatic coast and its hinterland, corded-ware has been found in settlements, but also in tumuli exhibiting steppe burial techniques. Two phases of corded-ware have been distinguished in this region: the twisted cord technique is characteristic of the older phase, while the interwoven cord technique is characteristic of the younger. Older-phase corded-ware were only found in some settlements in Pelagonia, while corded-ware at the remaining sites, including Lazaruša, belong to the younger phase. The sites containing younger corded-ware in southeastern Europe are concentrated in the eastern Balkans, the eastern Adriatic coast and its hinterland and in central Greece. Corded-ware are unknown to the central Balkans. The author rightly concludes that corded-ware made their way from the eastern Balkans to the eastern Adriatic coast via Aegean Macedonia. Such ceramics, as well as "Adriatic Eneolithic" ceramics in Dikili Tash in the southern section of the Drama river valley testify to this fact. Now it is clear how other eastern Balkan features, above all grooved-ware, came here as well. Due to the small number of corded-ware findings on the eastern Adriatic coast and its hinterland and the doubtlessly local context to which they belong, it is impossible to prove any form of cultural or ethnic stratification of the indigenous substratum. However, this certainly does not exclude the possibility of immigration by smaller groups of new inhabitants to this region during the Advanced Eneolithic. The author closes his discussion of corded-ware with the following conclusion: *"Therefore, without completely excluding the possibility of the presence of smaller groups of corded-ware carriers in the wider Adriatic hinterland, I nonetheless prefer to view the findings of this type in Lazaruša as a result of certain forms of cultural diffusion. In this context, these findings no longer live next to local cultures, but are rather their integral components"* (p. 172). Such a conclusion can automatically be applied to the grooved-ware at Lazaruša. Several pages later, the author will express some rather different opinions, to which I will make reference again.

Less numerous features are: vessels with thick collars, Ljubljana-style ceramics, "early Cetina" ceramics and barbotine-ware. Several pieces of pottery are decorated in the style of the Kostolac and Vučedol cultures, but they are locally-made products.

A lid with a solid round handle in the middle, ornamented with triangles filled with thick punctures with white incrustations (Fig. 9) is, for now, a unique Eneolithic find in eastern Adriatic coast and its hinterland. The author concludes that an analogy to this lid should be sought outside of the immediate region, but he found no adequate examples. Therefore I must point out that such lids were found in Bulgaria, particularly in Ezerovo II near Varna. They often have corded decorations on them (Tončeva 1981, Fig. 12: 8-13; Fig. 14: 12), while one lid even has decorations similar to those on the artefact from Lazaruša (Roman *et al.* 1992, Pl. 45: 1). Therefore, the lid from Lazaruša belongs in the eastern Balkan component.

There are white incrustations on several vessels. The author believes that the incrustation technique in Lazaruša was transferred from the Kostolac or Vučedol cultures (pp. 173-174). Such a conclusion cannot be accepted, because incrustations were also known in Dikili Tash and at sites with corded-ware in the eastern Balkans (Roman *et al.* 1992, 61, 67-68, 93-94), while almost all incrustated pottery from Lazaruša belong to the eastern Balkan component!

In concluding this discussion, the author says that in Phase II of Lazaruša, *"the cultural physiognomy is very complex, and it is determined by a number of features which have already been observed at other Advanced Eneolithic sites of the eastern Adriatic and its hinterland. In this sense, this phase at Lazaruša fits into general developmental processes very well, although it exhibits certain specific aspects which are manifested in somewhat different*

mutual relationships between individually observed features. First and foremost, this pertains to the very-well represented grooved and corded-ware on which basis it is possible to conceive of a given participation of new populations in the formation of its expression, even though it is difficult to say what form of participation was involved in this sense: direct or indirect. On the other hand, not even the other features - findings of the Cetina type, Ljubljana type, vessels with thick collars, bowls with diagonally-cut rims - do not show a very great deviation from their customary presence at other sites. This fact leaves open the possibility of conjecturing on some form of symbiosis between indigenous and new elements" (p. 177). The conclusion that less numerous components at Lazaruša do not show a great deviation from their customary presence at other sites contradicts a fact the author emphasised at several other places in this book. Namely, only one potsherd of a pot with a thick collar was found at Lazaruša, while this is the most numerous component at other sites, with the exception of Guvnine. This indicates that it is a matter of the direct activity of new inhabitants in the creation of the complex cultural physiognomy at Lazaruša, and that the new inhabitants had a much larger share than the indigenous inhabitants, at least at the beginning of the process. The community that inhabited Lazaruša was too small to carry out such a complex process, so I therefore suppose that it was part of a larger organised community. It is important to note that Lazaruša contained no bowls with expanded inward diagonally-cut rims, which is the second most numerous component on all other sites, except Guvnine. Their mention at the end of the discussion is probably just a lapse, for the author does not present drawings of them nor does he mention them in his exhaustive description of pottery finds.

At several places in this book, the author once more points out - on the basis of solid arguments - that the Eneolithic on the eastern Adriatic coast and its hinterland can only be divided into two developmental phases. Out of these two, the younger phase accounts for a period that corresponds to the Middle and Late Eneolithic in its customary division, although the most acceptable term for it would be Advanced Eneolithic. This phase is characterised by two primary and several secondary components. The primary components are: pots with thick collars and bowls with expanded inward diagonally-cut rims. The secondary components are: Ljubljana-style ceramics, Vučedol ceramics, grooved-ware and corded-ware. The author also considers the "early Cetina" ceramics secondary component, but I prefer to consider it a primary component, a point I shall expand upon hereafter. Primary components account for over 70 % of the ceramic findings, while the rest are secondary. Despite the larger number of components, this phase is a completely compact unit, while stratigraphic data do not allow for any divisions. Secondary components do not have the value of independent and compact cultures in this region and they do not permit speculation on the massive influx of new inhabitants. Nonetheless, the concentration of grooved ceramics at Guvnine and Lazaruša, as well as corded-ware at the latter site, do indicate the presence of individual and smaller groups of new inhabitants in this area, which due to their numerical inferiority were not able to spur either the cultural or ethnic stratification of the indigenous substratum. This is also backed up by the presence of tumuli that exhibit steppe burial techniques. The author concludes that *"despite the larger number of cultural features associated with various regions in the Balkans and Pannonia, the basic agent of cultural development at this level of the Eneolithic remains the indigenous substratum or, more precisely, the agents of the Hvar-Lišići culture of the Late Neolithic, who at the end of this period of prehistory gradually lost their earlier identity, but nonetheless did not undergo a disappearing process, but rather a transformation process into a new cultural expression, first during the Early and then the Advanced Eneolithic"* (p. 186). Such a conclusion is completely sound.

Since the secondary components are not independent and compact cultures, the question emerges of whether the horizon of the Advanced Eneolithic is a separate culture. The author has not taken a stance on this point to this day.

The pottery and ornamentation types originally associated with the eastern Adriatic coast, as well as the fact that elements of other cultures were adopted by the local population, indicates that the horizon of the Advanced Eneolithic nevertheless represents a separate culture, regardless of whether that culture is largely compilatory and cannot be chronologically broken down, and it is a long-term phenomenon. This is in fact the most interesting aspect of this culture. What remains, then, is only its designation. There is not a wide variety of choices in this search, for no other investigated site completely exhibits the content of this culture, nor can it be deemed more attractive than other sites. Roughly forty years ago, Paola Korošec referred to this horizon as the Adriatic group, or culture, and I believe that even today this is the most appropriate designation (Korošec 1962, 213-238). To be sure, the content of this culture is much more complex than defined at the time by P. Korošec. The Adriatic group designation does not contradict the terminology employed in Italian archaeology, for no prehistoric cultures in Italy were given this name.

The question also arises of the relationship between Adriatic and Cetina cultures. The author's view is that the Cetina culture emerged during the Eneolithic. Ivan Marović and Borivoj Čović placed the early Cetina culture at the end of the Eneolithic and at the transition into the Early Bronze Age. In contrast to them, the author believes that the early Cetina culture belongs to the Advanced Eneolithic (pp. 120-121, 131). In a work he wrote subsequently but published before this book, he explained that the Eneolithic phase of the Cetina culture cannot be considered an independent phenomenon; rather is still an integral part of the Advanced Eneolithic on the eastern Adriatic coast and its hinterland. In other words, what is characteristic of the Advanced Eneolithic is also characteristic of the Eneolithic phase of the Cetina culture (Marijanović 1998, 6-7)!

If the Eneolithic phase of the Cetina culture is not an independent phenomenon, then what are the criteria for discerning it from the Adriatic culture? It follows that the sole criterion is the tie between some sites from the Advanced Eneolithic to Dalmatinska Zagora, i.e. the region in which the Cetina culture will develop in the Early Bronze Age, and this is unacceptable. There is truly no logic in saying that Advanced Eneolithic sites in Herzegovina, on the Dalmatian islands and in the Hrvatsko Primorje (Croatian Littoral) belong to one culture, while sites in Dalmatinska Zagora, geographically right in the middle, belong to another culture which is not even independent. From this one can conclude that the Cetina culture nevertheless emerged at the beginning of the Bronze Age, but also that it grew out of a Eneolithic substratum. Therefore, the short-term first phase of this culture belongs to the early Bronze Age. Since the decorations characteristic of the "Eneolithic phase of the Cetina culture" have no analogies outside of the eastern Adriatic region, for now they should be considered an indigenous decorative style of the Adriatic culture.

I would like to make a few more points on the Cetina culture. Indeed, two potsherds characteristic of the Cetina culture were found in the Phase III layer of Hateljska Pećina (Fig. 28; Pl. 32: 2), but the author, strangely, does not allude to it nor does he dedicate any particular attention to them. The decorations on these fragments differ from the decorations on the ceramics that the author attributes to the "Eneolithic phase of the Cetina culture". These two potsherds are characteristic of Phase II of the Cetina culture according to the periodization of I. Marović and B. Čović - a phase which otherwise belongs to the Early Bronze Age. Of the fragment on Pl. 32: 2, the author says that it belongs at the very end of Phase III of Hateljska Pećina. The stratigraphy in Hateljska Pećina indicates that in the chronological

sense this phase also covers the older portion of the Early Bronze Age, so this explains the appearance of these fragments in the younger portion of this phase. Therefore, one can assume for just these two fragments from the Phase III layer that they are the result of movements of livestock herders, agents of the Cetina culture, and their contacts with the inhabitants of Hateljska Pećina.

Research has produced significant results for a better understanding of the Early and Middle Bronze Age, i.e. the Posušje culture.

Phase IVa of Hateljska Pećina belongs to the younger portion of the Early Bronze Age, or Phase II of the Posušje culture. The author emphasises that in Hateljska Pećina there is continuity between Phases III and IVa and that the hiatus that corresponds to the older portion of the Early Bronze Age, i.e. Phase I of the Posušje culture, only seems that way. He correctly concludes that in the developmental sense Phase III belongs to the Advanced Eneolithic, while in the chronological sense it also covers a portion of the Early Bronze Age - precisely that portion which corresponds to Phase I of the Posušje culture. This is additionally confirmed by the two above-mentioned potsherds that belong to Phase II of the Cetina culture. The author believes that the Advanced Eneolithic in Hateljska Pećina partially lasted even during the Early Bronze Age due to the very process of the Posušje culture's formation, which proceeded in a somewhat narrower space than it occupied in subsequent development, but he does not delve any further into these matters (p. 132). I will return to this problem shortly.

A potsherd adorned with concentric grooved circles accompanied by a series of stamped ornaments (Fig. 30) was found in Phase IVa of Hateljska Pećina. The author believes that this is a part of the Eneolithic tradition, but in a developmental context that delineates Hateljska Pećina (pp. 133-134). Such a conclusion is placed into question by two facts. First, only one potsherd with the grooved decoration (Fig. 28) was found in the Phase III layer of Hateljska Pećina, but the design is linear, and this vessel is, as I mentioned previously, characteristic of the Cetina culture. Second, the concentric grooved circles accompanied by a series of stamps are also present in the Cetina culture, where they are obviously a part of the Eneolithic heritage (Čović 1983, Pl. 27: 5; Marović - Čović 1983, Pl. 31: 3). Accordingly, the decorations on the potsherd shown in Fig. 30 belongs to the Eneolithic tradition, but not the tradition from Phase III of Hateljska Pećina. It is therefore more likely that this fragment as well is the result of contacts between agents of the Cetina culture and the inhabitants of Hateljska Pećina, but at a somewhat later time and under different cultural circumstances.

Phase II of Guvnine and Phase IVb of Hateljska Pećina belong to the Middle Bronze Age, or the late Posušje culture. It is precisely these two sites that facilitated the definition of the late Posušje culture.

A great novelty for the Middle Bronze Age in Herzegovina is the complex defence system of the hillfort at Guvnine. Judging by some forms of handles on vessels, which have their analogies at Velika Gradina (gradina - *eng.* hillfort) in Varvara near Prozor, the hillfort at Guvnine was established at the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age, and there is no evidence that it was inhabited up to the beginning of the Late Bronze Age. The author states that in the wider environs of the Guvnine hillfort there are several other concurrent hillforts defended by stone ramparts, of which the most similar is Jasočka Gradina near Crnići.

The Middle Bronze Age in the north-western Balkans was a peaceful period when the population generally lived in lowland settlements and in caves. Weapons in graves are very rare, while the contents of their hoards remain unknown. The majority of the hillforts settled during the Early Bronze Age were abandoned. Life continued in a few such hillforts into the Middle Bronze Age, but they were not protected by ramparts. The exception is Istria, where several settlements defended by stone ramparts

were established during the Middle Bronze Age - although current knowledge indicates that the situation in eastern Herzegovina was similar.

The author does not explain why the establishment of settlements protected by stone ramparts came about in eastern Herzegovina during the Middle Bronze Age. The most probable reason is that a turbulent period caused by population movements that began in the Early Bronze Age lasted also during the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age in eastern Herzegovina. Only later did stabilisation occur, i.e. a more peaceful period of human existence emerged.

Two fragments of fine ceramic vessels, produced on a pottery wheel and dyed red and dark brown (Fig. 34 and 35), were found in the Phase IVb layer of Hateljska Pečina. They are certainly a completely foreign phenomenon in the Posušje culture and in the western Balkans. These ceramics come from a region in which the use of the pottery wheel was already completely customary, i.e. from the region of the Mycenaean culture. Although these potsherds have no marked typological features, the chronological position of Hateljska Pečina's Phase IVb in relation to Greece and the position of these potsherds at the end of this phase precludes their linkage to a period prior to Phase IIIa of the Late Helladic period. In recent time several fragments of two Mycenaean painted vessels were found in the hillfort at Škrip on the island of Brač (Gaffney *et al.* 2001, 148, Fig. 7). Furthermore, several fragments of a Mycenaean vessel were also found at the Monkodonja hillfort near the town of Rovinj in Istria (Mihovilić *et al.* 2001, 50). Recently Stašo Forenbaher expressed the opinion that there are no imported Mycenaean artefacts in the north-western Balkans and he brought into question the Mycenaean origin of the two fragments of a ceramic vessel from Debelo Brdo in Sarajevo (Forenbaher 1995, 272-274). However, the new discovery of Mycenaean ceramics at Hateljska Pečina, Škrip and Monkodonja refute this claim.

The results of the digs at these sites, particularly in Hateljska Pečina, once more confirmed the view of cultural development during the Eneolithic and Bronze Age on the eastern Adriatic coast and its hinterland already put forward by I. Marović, B. Čović and B. Marijanović in their numerous works. The portrayals of cultural development advanced in recent time by Blagoje Govedarica and Philippe Della Casa have been proven inaccurate (Govedarica 1989, 199-230; Della Casa 1996, 127-135).

At the end of the book, the author makes the following conclusion: *"It is a fact, additionally, that developmental processes in Herzegovina have a completely indigenous character, although here this concept should be equated with the agents of development, meaning the inhabitants that create it. For there are no periods of prehistory in the territory of Herzegovina in which it is possible to prove not only changes in the 'ethnic' composition, but also any more serious influx of new populations. To be sure, smaller population infiltrations can be observed, but what cannot be observed is a new course of developmental processes as a result. The rare and meagre populations which made their way into this region never succeeded in assimilating the indigenous substratum, rather they were assimilated themselves and their ultimate achievement consisted of bringing in new elements to the cultural features of the local population. This process, however, did not have the character of imposing a foreign style or cultural expression, but only the selection of certain appearances and their adaptation to the perceptions and mentality of the local substratum"* (p. 188). Such a conclusion cannot be accepted, for if there were no massive immigrations of new inhabitants during any phase of prehistoric era, then how did this region become completely Indo-Europeanised? During the Iron Age eastern Herzegovina was settled by the Illyrians, while western Herzegovina was settled by the Delmatae, and it is known for certain that these ethnic groups were Indo-European. When did the massive settlement of new inhabitants on the eastern Adriatic coast and its hinterland occur? The answer to this question was provided by B. Čović and Frano

Prendi, but the author neglected their conclusions (Čović 1977, 55; Prendi 1978, 45; Čović 1986, 64-65; Čović 1991, 27-28). They provided firm evidences that a major watershed in the cultural development of this region occurred at the beginning of the Early Bronze Age, which is confirmed by the appearance and domination of new forms, decorations and even technologies in the production of pottery. This watershed could have been provoked only by the massive immigration of a new, numerous and organisationally superior population. B. Čović tentatively refers to this population as "carriers of coarse-ware ceramics", thereby designating only one of the archaeologically most easily recognisable elements of the material culture, common to all groups that belonged to this population. This population, undoubtedly livestock herders, spread from the eastern Balkans to other parts of the peninsula during the last centuries of the third millennium BC. The expansion of this population should be viewed as subdued movement of a large number of smaller social groups linked by some distant kinship ties and sometimes, during shorter periods of sedentary existence, in casual mutual contact. Some of these communities halted earlier, others wandered farther. They did not devastate the indigenous inhabitants they came upon, nor did they subjugate them, rather they mingled with them and created new cultural-ethnic communities that were undoubtedly already Indo-European.

This process has also been well-documented in Hateljska Pečina, but the author did not notice it. Although there is continuity between Phases III and IVa, numerous completely new forms of pottery lead to the conclusion that after the end of Phase III there was a powerful break in the cultural development of this settlement. The author himself says that the typological features of the pottery that link Phase IVa with the preceding phase are not numerous (p. 133). The change can only be explained by the arrival of a new population in the region, but this does not mean that it immediately stratified the indigenous population in Hateljska Pečina. Namely, the largest number of vessels in Phase IVa were made using a technology characteristic of the Eneolithic tradition, while only a minor number were made using a technology not characteristic of the Eneolithic. This indicates that the indigenous population continued to inhabit Hateljska Pečina, but adapted to the new situation and began to mingle with the new settlers. Since Phase III covers also the older portion of the Early Bronze Age in the chronological sense, it is obvious that in the beginning the indigenous population in Hateljska Pečina was sidelined in this process, but it succumbed to the changes with time. In Phase IVb, pottery production technology predominates which does not belong to the Eneolithic tradition, so that one can conclude that the indigenous inhabitants melded with the new and more numerous population, i.e. the process of Indo-Europeanization in Herzegovina was completed.

In this vein, there is no doubt that the agents of the Posušje culture were Indo-Europeans. As opposed to the Posušje culture, the Cetina culture is genetically tied to the Advanced Eneolithic, which means that its agents were an old Mediterranean population that was certainly partially Indo-Europeanised, but nevertheless not Indo-European.

At the end, I would like to mention that it is noticeable that the author is not sufficiently knowledgeable in the typology of stone implements. He states that an artefact from Hateljska Pečina shown in Pl. 1: 5 is a massive knife, even though, judging by the drawing, it is in fact a side scraper. Similarly, he designates two artefacts from Lazaruša as knives, which for the specimen shown on Pl. 1: 1 is only partially accurate, while for the specimen shown on Pl. 1: 2 it is not accurate at all. The orientation of the artefacts on the drawings is incorrect, i.e. upside-down. The first specimen is an endscraper on a blade, while the second is a side scraper.

The value of the book is diminished because of the lack of analysis of natural science disciplines. Thus no radiocarbon (C-14) analysis was conducted of any charcoal sample, nor

were palynological analyses of soil samples and petrographic analyses of stone artefacts conducted. The author conducted the osteological analyses of animal bones himself, but these analyses is superficial and unprofessional.

I would like to make several technical remarks about this book as well. The illustrations are not numbered in continuity, but rather for each thematic unit separately, which will create difficulties, particularly in the future citation of the plates. Several works cited by abbreviations in the notes are not in the bibliography, so determining their titles has been rendered difficult (see notes 57, 58 and 59 in the subsection *Guvnine*, notes 62 and 63 in the subsection *Hateljska Pečina* and note 30 in the subsection *Lazaruša*). The printer *Zrinski*, from the town of Čakovec, did not carry out its task in line with the highest standards of quality, for the illustrations were prepared using weak computer equipment or the work was entrusted to insufficiently qualified persons. Therefore the reproductions of black and white photographs came out either too dark or too light, while the reproductions of the outstanding drawings are worse than the original, which is clearly seen in the broken lines. Unfortunately, this has been a frequent trait of printing practices in Croatia during the last ten years.

Regardless of disagreements over certain specific matters, this book is a capital work of lasting value and unavoidable for the knowledge of the Neolithic, Eneolithic and Bronze Age on the eastern Adriatic coast and its hinterland. I believe that it is not an exaggeration to say that this book can be ranked among the top works on prehistoric archaeology in southeastern Europe.

Darko Periša
Božidara Magovca 157
HR-10000 Zagreb

The autonomous towns of Noricum and Pannonia / Die autonomen Städte in Noricum und Pannonien. Noricum, M. Šašel Kos, P. Scherrer (Hrsg.). Situla 40. Narodni muzej Slovenije, Ljubljana 2002. ISSN 0583-4554. 279 Seiten mit zahlreichen Abbildungen, Karten und Tabellen.

Christian GUGL

Der Sammelband "The autonomous towns of Noricum and Pannonia / Die autonomen Städte in Noricum und Pannonien: Noricum", herausgegeben von M. Šašel Kos und P. Scherrer, umfasst zehn Beiträge, die anlässlich einer internationalen Konferenz im März 1999 in Brdo bei Ljubljana gehalten wurden.

Die von M. Šašel Kos angeregte und unter Mithilfe zahlreicher Fachkollegen organisierte Konferenz versteht sich als Standortbestimmung der norisch-pannonischen Städteforschung, nachdem die letzte derartige Zusammenschau in der ANRW II 6 bereits über 20 Jahre zurück liegt. Der vom Narodni Muzej Slovenije in der hauseigenen Reihe "Situla" erschienene Band beinhaltet Beiträge zu sämtlichen neun norischen Städten. Es ist den beiden Herausgebern zu wünschen, dass eine Publikation zu den pannonischen Städten in vergleichbar

vorzüglicher Druckqualität in absehbarer Zeit erfolgen kann.

Den Einzeldarstellungen der neun norischen Städte ist ein umfangreicher Beitrag von P. Scherrer vorangestellt (S. 12-70), der anhand epigraphischer Quellen Aspekte der Urbanisierung des Ostalpenraums behandelt. Das reichhaltige Inschriftenmaterial aus Noricum - Scherrer schätzt die Materialbasis auf rund 2000 Inschriften - bildet die Grundlage für eine vielschichtige Studie zur Verbreitung antiker Personennamen sowie ausgewählter einheimischer Gottheiten. Über die Verbreitung italischer Gentilnamen (Karten 1-10), wie der Barbii, Lollii, Sabinii und Cassii, erschließt er Wirkungs- und Einflussbereiche verschiedener einflussreicher Familien und Handelshäuser, die die wirtschaftlichen und politischen Geschehnisse Noricums in der frühen und mittleren Kaiserzeit entscheidend beeinflussten. Scherrer kann sich dabei bereits auf umfangreiche Vorarbeiten stützen, wie beispielsweise die Arbeiten G. Alföldys; hervorgehoben sei nur seine Studie zu den "Attii von Solva" (Festschrift Modrijan, *Schild St.* 15-16, 1978-1979, 89 ff.).

Zurecht hebt Scherrer auf S. 22 f. als methodisches Problem die chronologische Spannbreite bei der Datierung der Steindenkmäler hervor, die die Beurteilung der Rolle dieser in ihren Ursprüngen italischen Familien bei der "Romanisierung Noricums", einem zeitlich zu differenzierenden Akkulturationsprozess, erschweren. Bei den kartographisch gut umgesetzten Verbreitungsbildern wäre in dem einen oder anderen Fall auch die Einbeziehung der westlich angrenzenden Nachbarprovinz Raetien wünschenswert, vor allem dann, wenn es um den Aktionsradius dieser "Handelshäuser" geht. Eine Detailstudie auf epigraphischer Basis zu den wirtschaftlichen Verflechtungen in diesem Raum wäre im Hinblick auf die Außengrenze des illyrischen Zollbezirks sicherlich lohnenswert, nachdem gerade jüngst wieder eine Arbeit erschienen ist, die die "Kulturgrenze am Inn" anhand einer Kleinfundgattung thematisiert (M. Gschwind, O. Ortisi, *Germania* 79, 2001, 401 ff.; bes. 408 ff.).

In einem zweiten Abschnitt widmet sich der Autor dem Auftreten von Weihe- und Bauinschriften, die mit der Verehrung des Bedaius, Belinus/Belestis und Marmogius/Latobius (Karte 13) sowie dem Kult einheimischer, mit Iupiter gleichgesetzter Gottheiten (Karte 14) zusammenhängen. Anhand von Kartenbildern gelingt es Scherrer, den regionalen Charakter dieser Gottheiten zu untermauern und im Falle von Marmogius/Latobius-Inschriften über das Namensmaterial der Dedikanten verwandschaftliche Verbindungen nach Celeia und das südwest-